THE CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER - DECEMBER 1960

Contents

Vol. LXXIV. No. 4
New Series

PAGE

EDITORIAL 227

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TODAY
The Rev. H. L. Ellison, B.A., B.D. 231

THE SCOPE OF THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT
The Rev. Francis I. Andersen, M.A., B.D., M.Sc., Ph.D. 239

ADVERSUS JUDAEOS: THE JEWS IN HISTORY
The Rev. Jakob Jocz, Ph.D., D.Litt. 245

IS THERE A FUTURE FOR THE JEWS?
The Rev. George H. Stevens, M.Th.... 253

BOOK REVIEWS

J. H. S. Burleigh : *A Church History of Scotland* ... 263
Ed. Ronald Selby Wright : *Fathers of the Kirk*... ... 264
Stewart Mechie : *The Church and Scottish Social Development*, 1780-1870 265
A. Skevington Wood : *The Inextinguishable Blaze* ... 266
Hans Conzelmann : *The Theology of Saint Luke* ... 267
Helmut Thielicke : *The Waiting Father* 268
A. J. B. Higgins : *The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel* ... 269
Bernhard W. Anderson : *Rediscovering the Bible* ... 270
H. C. Jackson : *Pastor on the Nile* 271
Elsie M. Baker : *Broken Patterns* 272
Lin Yutang : *From Pagan to Christian* 273
E. L. Allen : *Christianity among the Religions* 274
W. R. Niblett : *Christian Education in a Secular Society* 276
A. F. Kersting and C. L. S. Linnell : *English Cathedrals in Colour*... 277
Nathaniel Micklem : *The Labyrinth Revisited* 278

INDEX FOR 1960 279

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :
THE REV. PHILIP E. HUGHES, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed.

Books for review, manuscripts, and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : Two Shillings and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings per annum, post free.

In the U.S.A., annual subscription one dollar, payable to The Seminary Bookstore, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., U.S.A.

Publishers :
CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

Writers in this Issue

FRANCIS ANDERSEN is Vice-Principal of Ridley Theological College, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

H. L. ELLISON, Lecturer and Writer, is a Hebrew Christian in the Ministry of the Church of England. His publications include *The Christian Approach to the Jew*, *Men Spake from God*, *Ezekiel : The Man and his Message*, and *From Tragedy to Triumph : Studies in the Book of Job*.

JAKOB JOCZ, also a Hebrew Christian and in the Anglican Ministry, is Professor of Systematic Theology at Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada. His published works include *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ* and *A Theology of Election*, and his book *The Spiritual History of Israel* is soon to be published.

GEORGE STEVENS is Editorial Secretary of the Church Missions to Jews.

Editorial

BISHOP CHARLES GORE was described by Bishop Hensley Henson in 1910 as " perhaps the most influential and in some ways the most attractive clergyman in the English Church ". It was Gore, more than any other, who at a time of transition gave a stability to the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England by the moderating and modernizing influence of his writings. Two important books which have been published recently remind us effectively of the content and significance of Gore's thought. They are : GORE : *A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought* by James Carpenter (Faith Press, 307 pp., 30s.) and FROM GORE TO TEMPLE : *The Development of Anglican Theology between Lux Mundi and the Second World War*, 1889-1939 by the Archbishop of York, Dr. A. M. Ramsey (Longmans, 192 pp., 18s. 6d.). The appearance in 1889 of *Lux Mundi* certainly marked the commencement of a new era in Anglican theology—not that its doctrines were entirely novel, any more than were the theories propounded by Charles Darwin in his *Origin of Species* when it appeared thirty years earlier : it is possible to point to an ancestry in both cases. It is impact, not necessarily originality, that initiates a new era. The service which the *Lux Mundi* symposiasts performed for Anglo-Catholicism (though how far it was a service for Christianity as a whole is no less open to debate now than it was in Gore's day) was to accommodate it to modern modes of philosophical and scientific thought, thus clothing it with an air of contemporaneous respectability. In their own words, their aim was " to put the Catholic faith in its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems ". They were, as Archbishop Ramsey describes them, " men of synthesis ", who " united the piety and churchmanship of the Tractarians and the critical spirit which had found clumsy expression a few decades earlier in *Essays and Reviews* ".

In the same year that *Lux Mundi* appeared Gore wrote: " I believe with a conviction the intensity of which I can hardly express that it is . . . the God-given vocation of the Church of England to realize and offer men a Catholicism which goes behind the Reformation in real and unimpaired connection with the Catholicism of the past . . . which is Scriptural . . . which is rational . . . which is free to deal with the new problems and wants of a new time ". Insofar as this is compatible with what Dr. Ramsey calls " the Anglican appeal to Scripture, antiquity, and reason ", we have no quarrel ; but insofar as it implies that the Reformation had the effect of severing the roots that held the Church to the Catholicism of the past, we must protest. The Reformation was essentially, of course, a return to the pure Catholicism of the New Testament, but not in such a way that the intervening centuries of the Church's existence were ignored, nor in a way that did despite to the faculty of reason with which man has been endowed. None studied the Church Fathers and their traditions more avidly than did the leaders of the Reformation. They valued

highly and were careful to preserve the continuity with the past. It was in the light of reason that many of the extravagances and crudities of papalism were exposed. Indeed, it was precisely on the appeal to Scripture, antiquity, and reason that the Reformers' case rested, as their writings make abundantly plain. And it is precisely when Anglo-Catholicism seeks to introduce into the Church of England doctrines and practices which were repudiated by the Reformers on the grounds of Scripture, tradition, and reason that the issue of the Reformation is opened once again.

Gore was convinced that Tractarianism, if it was to survive as a force in the Church, needed a measure of liberalization, in particular with respect to the injection into its blood-stream of biblical criticism, the evolutionary hypothesis, and socialistic thought and action. As Mr. Carpenter observes, " in this matter of Gore's Liberal Catholicism it is not easy to separate with any degree of precision his liberalism from his Catholicism. In some cases his liberalism controlled his conception of Catholicism, and in others the reverse seems to be true." The old " high-churchmen " had maintained a high doctrine of the infallibility of Scripture. Gore's coming to terms with biblical criticism was enough to break Liddon's heart and to cause him to charge Gore with having capitulated to German rationalism, and his kenotic views were violently attacked by Bishop Stubbs of Oxford. Gore's evolutionism, though not so extreme as that propounded by some of his fellow-Anglo-Catholic theologians—J. R. Illingworth, for example, spoke of the Incarnation as having introduced a new species into the world !—is well summed up in his view of the Incarnation as " the crown of natural development ". It has, in fact, become typical of Anglo-Catholic thought to conceive the Incarnation in evolutionistic terms, the significance of which had early on been indicated by the expression *Christus Consummator* which Westcott gave to one of his books. The exact manner in which evolution has been incorporated into the theology of the Incarnation has varied with different writers, though the over-all pattern has been of a kind. Thus, for example, William Temple adapted it to his philosophy of value and expounded it as the keystone of the universal order which has ascended through the successive stages of matter, life, mind, and spirit ; and L. S. Thornton, following the lead given by the philosophy of A. N. Whitehead, propounded the theory of an " organic " progression whereby every higher stage of development not only supersedes but also includes every lower stage, and the whole universal system is embraced and exalted by the culminating stage which is the Incarnation. This concept of the Incarnation as the crown of natural development is, in our judgment, incompatible with the true nature and purpose of the Incarnation, and has, more than anything else in the theology of the last hundred years, had the effect of shifting the centre of gravity of Christian soteriology from Calvary to Bethlehem, from the Cross to the Cradle.

The socialism which Gore advocated was in the main exceptionally sane and perceptive. He foresaw the very real dangers of the Welfare State and even of democracy, precisely because of the selfish impulses of unregenerate men and women. He realized that " the popular

cry for social regeneration is accompanied in such . . . slender measure with the sense of the need of personal regeneration ", and that it is Christ who " is the true liberator, the true emancipator of man, because He laid the foundation of human liberty so deep in the redemption of the individual from personal sin and selfishness ".

The writings of Bishop Gore are a thing of the past and they will be disinterred only or at any rate mainly by those who are pursuing some line theological research ; but Gore's influence continues in the Anglo-Catholic thought of our day, and may indeed be said to have been in large measure formative of it—though he would have dissociated himself from the " typological eccentricity " (as Archbishop Ramsey calls it) which has characterized the biblical interpretation of some more recent Anglo-Catholic scholars.

Mr. Carpenter's book may be commended as an admirable study of Gore's thought—thorough, intelligent, well articulated, and amply documented. It does not need predictive ability to say that it will become authoritative within its particular field. We would suggest that many of the longer footnotes might with advantage be moved up into the main body of the text since they, and the quotations they frequently contain, are so germane to the substance of the work. The Archbishop's book is, as we expect it to be, clearly written and ably executed, and is marked throughout by a spirit of charity. He, if anyone, may be described as standing within the tradition of Gore today, in respect both of theological sympathy and intellectual ability. The period he reviews was on the whole a lean one for Evangelical scholarship ; yet it was not entirely barren, and one would have liked to see some reference to the work of men like Wace, Litton, Griffith-Thomas, Dimock, and Tomlinson. Bishop Handley Moule receives one mention, and some appreciation is shown of the writings of the non-Anglican scholars, Denney, Dale, and Forsyth. One might judge from this work that Anglo-Catholics are " typical " Anglicans, and there might be some question concerning the interpretation of the statement that during the half-century under survey " there was for all typical Anglicans, not least those of the Anglo-Catholic school, no hesitancy on the cardinal convictions of the Reformation : that works cannot earn salvation, that salvation is by grace alone received through faith, that nothing can add to the sole mediatorship of the Cross of Christ, that Holy Scripture is the supreme authority in doctrine " ; but we earnestly hope that this may become increasingly true of our Church of England during the decades that lie ahead.

* * * *

The articles in this issue are devoted to the consideration of certain aspects of the subject of Christianity and the Jew—a subject that is not without its perplexities, but the importance of which should never be minimized. There is a tendency for the Christian to feel that he ought not to " interfere " with the Jew and his religion. But we have a special responsibility to bring the evangel to the Jew, reasoning with him out of the Scriptures, as was the Apostle's custom of old, and opening and alleging that the Messiah must needs have

suffered and risen again from the dead, and that the Jesus whom we proclaim is the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy and promise (Acts xvii. 2f.). Too many Christians today are inexcusably unfamiliar with the Old Testament Scriptures and have little appreciation of their significance. The recovery of the sense of their significance will mean the recovery of the sense of responsibility to the Jew, because it will give substance to our appreciation of the significance of Jesus Christ to the Jew as well as to the nations of the world. "What does the Lord do after He has come back to His disciples from the land of death?" asks Helmut Gollwitzer in that most remarkable series of sermons published earlier this year under the title *The Dying and Living Lord.* "What is it that *He* regards as the most important thing to do? He gives them a Bible lesson. . . . 'Then He opened their minds to understand the Scriptures'. . . . How could anyone possibly hit upon the wrong idea that the Church could do without the Old Testament, even for a day, when Jesus Christ, after His Resurrection, had nothing more important to do than to open the Old Testament and to expound its meaning? How could anyone even think that it is still the Church of Christ if it closes the Old Testament instead of opening it? How is it possible for people to think that we become more Christian, that we can witness to Christ better, if we break with the Old Testament?" P.E.H.

The Significance of the Old Testament Today

By H. L. Ellison

THE infant Church was born and spent the first formative years of its life within the framework of Judaism. There can be little doubt that it was the toleration won by the Qumran Covenanters, influential more by the quality than the quantity of their membership, that enabled the Church to grow up in Jerusalem and Palestine with only occasional persecution. Gamaliel's shrewd *apologia* for toleration (Acts v. 34-39) probably represented less his own convictions and more his recognition that the leaders of the persecutors were Sadducees, whom he disliked and feared far more than the Nazarenes. This position lasted until the great revolt against Rome, and even more Bar Kochba's revolt (132-135) demonstrated clearly that the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth had created a very wide gulf between the Christian Jew and other members of his nation.

The developing worship of the Synagogue formed the pattern for the Church's own worship, a pattern that has never been quite lost. Through John the Baptist Christian Baptism was in some way linked with the familiar Jewish baptism of proselytes. The Lord's Supper, though striking a new note by its weekly, or it may be even more frequent, celebration, was firmly anchored in the Passover supper. Above all the Church took over, automatically and without question, the Old Testament. To many it must have been significant that the birthday of the Church fell on the Feast of Pentecost,[1] which for the Synagogue was traditionally the Feast of the Giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. They will have remembered that Jeremiah's promise (xxxi. 31-34) was of a new covenant with a new power, but not of a new law.[2] For the early Church the Old Testament was quite simply the Scriptures.

There was no significant change in the first few decades after the Church first turned to the Hellenistic world. Before the death of Paul there will have been few converts who had not been prepared in some measure for the Gospel message by contact with the Synagogue, whether they had become proselytes or only God-fearers, or whether it had been no more than a shaking of their pagan concepts by the vision of something profoundly different. Even in the most Gentile churches there will have been enough converts from Judaism to carry on Jewish views of the Old Testament.

There can be little doubt that C. H. Dodd is correct, when he maintains, in his book *According to the Scriptures*, that certain portions of the Old Testament were a fundamental portion of the basic *kerygma* (not merely certain proof-texts). Messianic significance was attributed to them, and the Church claimed the authority of Christ Himself for this interpretation (Luke xxiv. 27, 44). These passages will have been known by most Church members, so that even a passing reference to one of them in an apostolic letter will have been understood. This

means that while many parts of the Old Testament will have been unknown, or at the best imperfectly known to many Gentile Christians, they will have had a firm grasp of its heart.

To such an extent were the Old Testament Scriptures part of the Church's life that, as Melito of Sardis and the second column in Origen's *Hexapla* bear witness, they were for some centuries read in their original Hebrew in public worship, at least in some areas and on some occasions.[3]

The result of all this was that while the early Church had grown up with the controversy on the place and understanding of the Law of Moses in the new covenant, it had not asked itself what purpose the old Scriptures served now that the fulfilment had come and a new corpus of Scripture had grown up beside it. As so often happens in such cases, the first challenge to traditional views of sufficient importance to have been preserved in the memory of the Church went to extremes. Marcion (flourished about 140), whose upbringing had been Christian, for he was a son of the bishop of Synope in Pontus, had imbibed some measure of Gnostic dualism. He rejected the spiritual, in contrast to the historical, value of the Old Testament completely, and attributed no authority of any kind to it. The Church, stung to the quick, excommunicated him and reaffirmed the authority of the Old Testament.

The sequel was that any intelligent discussion on the place and use of the Old Testament had become virtually impossible, for anyone challenging accepted views ran the risk of being accused of Marcionism. It was inevitable that the use of the Old Testament should rapidly languish, and it soon became either a source of proof-texts, Messianic or otherwise, or a challenge to the skill of allegorizers.

In spite of a revival of interest in the Old Testament among the Reformers the position remained little changed down to the middle of the nineteenth century. Certain books like the Psalter—and this is true of every period of the Church's history—and many outstanding chapters were familiar, but the ordinary Christian had little conception what to do with it as a whole. It is true that the Brethren and those influenced by them suggested a better way, but it very soon ran to waste and was lost in the desert of exaggerated dispensationalism.

* * * *

The weakness of the ordinary Christian's position was shown clearly by the differing fate of the radical criticism of the Old and New Testaments. Though the latter has left permanent traces on our understanding of the New Testament, it has been decisively routed ; though constant efforts are being made to revive it, they are not likely to succeed. In contrast the radical criticism of the Old Testament has in the eyes of most been, until very recently, a complete victor. The vast majority of Protestant Christians, especially the more nominal among them, regard the Old Testament as a book whose historical narratives have little value and whose spiritual message is suspect.

This striking difference has not been due to the Old Testament critics being so much better scholars than their New Testament counterparts, or to the much greater vulnerability of the Old Testament.

It was simply that men cared passionately whether the New Testament was true or not, and so were prepared to give their time and best talents to proving its accuracy. With the Old Testament, however, they seldom felt it mattered enough to make the effort. Those who did care all too often descended to the fatal *a priori* argument that it must be true because it was inspired.

This is not the place to discuss the details of the remarkable swing towards orthodoxy of a sort among many Old Testament scholars in the last few decades. This has not been due primarily to modern archeological discoveries or any of the other adventitious aids the conservative is apt to grasp at so eagerly. The reason has been that in their study of the Old Testament, scholars have discovered for themselves that it is Word of God, and it has exercised its self-authenticating power on them.

This is the point where we must start, when we think of the significance of the Old Testament for today. It contains the revelation of God to Israel in centuries past both by act and word, and it is an abiding revelation to this day and for this day.

While the Old Testament in almost all its parts looks forward for the fulfilment of all it proclaims about the purposes of God, it is far more than merely foretelling, which has mere antiquarian interest now that the fulfilment has gone into effect. While it sketches the future lines of the kingdom of God, it is no mere set of blue-prints, the only value of which is to check the accuracy of God's present building. While it is a necessary preparation, without which the New Testament could not have been, it is no mere scaffolding, which now that God's goal has been reached, must be dismantled so that His structure may be seen in all its glory. It need hardly be added that it has not been handed down to us to serve as an intellectual stimulant to develop skill in allegorizing.

If we are to look for a picture of the Old Testament in its relationship to the New, which will in some true measure express its value, we should rather think of the building of some great cathedral. The Old Testament is its foundation and the lower courses of the walls. Viewed at this stage they give some concept of the wonder to come, but except for one who had seen the architect's plans or model they are insufficient to convey the grandeur of the builder's conception or to allow many of the parts to be identified with certainty, for the unifying element is lacking. The New Testament supplies the upper courses of the walls and the roof, thereby not merely completing the building, but creating an architectural unity and revealing its complete purpose. To put the matter thus is to go far beyond the Augustinian explanation : " The New is in the Old concealed ; the Old is in the New revealed," for it affirms not merely the unity but that each part needs the other, for neither is complete in itself.

To this many will at once object that the complete truth of God is to be found in the New Testament ; that even though certain doctrines may be expounded more clearly and in greater detail in the Old, for example, God as Creator and Ruler over the nations, in these matters the use of the Old is merely a convenience and not a necessity. This attitude is a legacy of the Hellenization of Christianity from the

second century on, which assumed virtually as an axiom that the prime purpose of revelation was the making known of certain truths about God, which otherwise would not have been attainable by men. As Emil Brunner has said, " Very early in the history of the Church . . . the idea arose under the influence of Greek philosophy that the divine revelation of the Bible had to do with the communication of those doctrinal truths which were inaccessible by themselves to human reason ; and correspondingly that faith consisted in holding these supernaturally revealed doctrines for truth."[4]

Even if the Old Testament were to serve no other purpose, its presence in the Canon of Scripture would be fully justified by its repeated denial of this theological concept held so widely both by Christian scholars and by many in the pews. For it God is not merely the God that speaks and in speaking reveals, but equally the God that acts ; and it is vain to ask whether the word or the act is more important or should have priority. It is no mere coincidence that in Hebrew *dabar* means, according to the context, word, thing, or happening.

Even E. J. Young, after quite correctly rejecting G. E. Wright's over-emphasis on God's acts,[5] but stressing the vital role of history in revelation, can allow himself to say : " It is true that God could have given His completed revelation to man at one time, had He so desired. He is an omnipotent God, and is not subject to man ".[6] This is a typical example of the theological fallacy mentioned earlier. The problem of revelation is not at the Divine end, but at the human ; it is not a question of what God can, but what man can. God's actions are essential if man is to understand His words.

We see this worked out in many ways in the Bible. Whether the historical background is expressly stated or not, the prophetic message is always placed in and conditioned by historical circumstances. We have no problem of suffering in the Bible, but only one of the sufferer.

In other words the history of God's people in the Old Testament is part of God's revelation, just as the history of Jesus Christ, who is the fulfilment of Israel (Isa. xlix. 3, R.V.), in incarnation, humiliation, death, resurrection, and exaltation is the climax of revelation. We repeat as a matter of course that what our Lord did is of more importance than what He taught. It is surely as true that what God did in the history of Israel was more important than His words that accompanied it.

It has been a sure instinct, then, that has made the Christian at every period recoil from replacing the Bible by a manual of theology. However perfectly it may summarize (and even expand !) the teaching of Scripture, it can never do justice to the history in Scripture, and is bound to a greater or less extent to divorce the teaching from the history.

Were we then to lose or abandon the Old Testament, we should lose the revelationary history contained in it (except in the small measure in which it is referred to in the New), and in addition the history in the New would largely lack its full meaning, because its necessary introduction would not be there.

We must carry this thought a step further. It was necessary that in the fulness of time the Word who was in the beginning should not

merely act, as He had done down through the ages, but become man. So in measure it was right through the history of Israel. God's speaking and acting was always in measure an imparting of Himself. Later Jewish thought could conceive of the Law as written in letters of fire in heaven, of which Moses made no more than a transcript. Islam can speak in the same way of the Quran. In both cases revelation is merely the transferring of the eternally existing creation into a new sphere. But in biblical revelation it is God Himself who comes into His creation, and coming leaves it other than it was for salvation or judgment.

* * * *

Some of the most stimulating writing on the Old Testament since the war has been on what is normally called Old Testament Theology. For the most part it has been an effort to let the Old Testament speak for itself in its own language. According to personal predilection some writers have stressed merely that it looks to a point beyond itself, that it is consciously incomplete; others have made it clear that it looks to Jesus Christ as the fulfiller and the focal point of its teaching. But one and all have refused to listen to E. J. Young's wish that Old Testament theology should serve "as a useful handmaid to the discipline of Systematic Theology".[7] They have insisted on the revelation contained in the Old Testament being allowed to be heard for its own sake, even though it is incomplete.

The results have been for the most part extraordinarily satisfying.[8] The Old Testament has emerged as a living book with a message in its own right which repeatedly demands a modification of much of our understanding of the New. That is because they are not two separate books. It would be a strange procedure to take a book on philosophy or science and then read the final third first; then having done so to interpret the first two-thirds from the impressions we had formed from the end. But that is how the Bible has so often been treated.

It was only natural that during the great period of creed-making and of the formulation of Christian doctrine, a period in which almost all contact had been lost with Jew and Jewish Christian alike, the Greek-speaking Fathers should interpret both the Old Testament in its Septuagint form and the New Testament in terms of the Greek which was their mother-tongue. As naturally, too, the Latin Fathers followed them.[9] The Reformation coincided with a revival in the knowledge of Hebrew, but there was hidden from the great translators of the Bible and the Reformation theologians the extent to which the New Testament depended on the translation Greek of the Septuagint. As a result the vocabulary of the two Testaments has shown an unjustifiable divergence in our standard versions.

Thanks especially to G. Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, of which unfortunately only a few of the main articles have been translated into English, the student who is not a linguistic expert has been enabled to trace the close links in language between the Testaments, and to interpret the New, not in terms of Hellenistic thought, but in those of the Old and of Jewish thought between the Testaments. The latter study has been even more aided by Strack-

Billerbeck : *Kommentar eum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* though here no portion has so far appeared in English. The swing in scholarly thought has gone so far, especially since the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, that today even John and Hebrews are being understood through Hebraic rather than Hellenistic thought.

Put simply it means that we have to learn *within reason* (all extremes are harmful) to interpret the New Testament in the light of the Old, and not the Old as though it were the New in the fancy dress of type and allegory. When we look at the few great commentaries that have retained their value down the centuries, we shall find that most of them conform to this pattern.

The consternation caused by a recent little book by the Swiss theologian Oscar Cullmann on the immortality of the soul is illuminating. He proclaimed on the basis of Scripture that it was not a biblical doctrine. Yet, for at least several centuries, many, more concerned with the Bible than Greek philosophy, have been saying the same thing. Perhaps it was some of their often unwarranted conclusions that caused them to be little listened to. If Cullmann has had a readier hearing, however, it will have been because of the new respect abroad for the Old Testament. The concept of the immortality of the soul cannot be demonstrated in a Jewish setting before the apocryphal *Wisdom of Solomon* (1st cent. B.C.), which was a product of the dispersion in Egypt and written under Hellenistic influence. There are no grounds for supposing that the writers of the New Testament, when they used *psychē*, were similarly influenced.

Far more important has been the realization that the anthropology of the Old Testament is quite other than that which we with our Hellenistic heritage have read into both Testaments. Old Testament man is neither bipartite nor tripartite, but a psychosomatic unity. *Nephesh,* which we have translated " soul " wherever the context would permit, is fundamentally man in his unity of life, of which body and spirit are integral and necessary parts. Even where parts of the body are mentioned in a metaphorical or semi-metaphorical manner—for example, heart, eyes, hands—it is the whole man expressing himself through that portion of his body, or what it symbolizes, that is implied. The unity of a man is a truth that both psychology and medicine have been learning, and now the Church is increasingly realizing its truth and some of its practical implications.

As a result of the growing importance of the body in Christian thought there is an increasing willingness to acknowledge that the eschatology of most dogmatic theology is not a fair reproduction of biblical eschatology. In spite of Greek mockery and scepticism the Church insisted on holding fast to the resurrection of the body, but it has often been a sore embarrassment to it. Today it is widely denied by many theologians, and it plays very little part in much popular Christianity, for " one goes to heaven when one dies ". For the rest this material universe was surrendered to neo-Platonic hatred of matter and was regarded as something which was fated to disappear for ever once its purpose was served. Where, however, the Old Testament stress on the body is accepted there has been a growing understanding also of its stress on this material world as God's crea-

tion. Hence, in spite of much bitter dogmatic assertion to the contrary, there is an increasing tendency to recognize that the chiliasm of the early Church, in spite of many extravagances, was nearer the spirit of Scripture than our obliteration of the material creation in favour of the spiritual.

* * * *

There are many reasons why the average Jew does not become a Christian, one of the most potent being that so often no Christian has made any effort to demonstrate the love of Christ to him. But where a God-fearing Jew has really been introduced to Jesus of Nazareth and yet rejects Him, the reason is normally that he does not see the tokens of the Messiah in society.

It would be unfair to suggest that the Church never had a vision of the Kingdom of God in society, or that having it, it lost it completely. It would be especially unfair to the great medieval experiment of the Church of Rome and to the efforts of many a social reformer and Christian socialist since that time. But the simple fact remains that while the Church has wrought very much good, it has conspicuously failed in its task of showing the power of God at work in society. It is a well-known fact that in the middle-ages in the rare cases of Christian-Jewish litigation, where it was open to the parties to go before a Christian or a Jewish court, the Christian almost always chose the Jewish court as more likely to do justice. If we were to compare any synagogue in Britain with a neighbouring church, it is almost certain that the synagogue will show a greater community spirit, a greater care for those that can be reached *organizationally*—the Jew himself is likely to acknowledge that where it is a call for the pure outpouring of *individual* love, the church will probably show up better every time.

The reason for this is not far to seek. We have always been slow to believe that the social legislation of the Pentateuch is a Divine revelation and an expression of God's will not merely for pre-Christian Israel but for mankind. It is all too often overlooked that in one of the peaks of Messianic prophecy (Isa. xi. 1-9), the King is marked out above all as the enforcer of social righteousness.

Behind this lies also our common misunderstanding of the New Testament teaching on Satan and the forces of evil. That the teaching of Christ and His apostles on this matter, as on others too, has gone well beyond that of the Old Testament is indubitable, but to go beyond does not mean to deny. Even if not in intent yet certainly in practice very much Christian theology, both scholarly and popular, is dualistic in outlook. It has entirely lost the Old Testament vision that Satan, however unwillingly, is an instrument in the hands of God to fulfil His will. We seldom catch the note of the Psalmist :

> Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee :
> the overflowings of wrath shalt Thou gird to Thyself as an ornament (Psa. lxxvi. 10).

Repeatedly I have found that for many the words of Isaiah are a stumbling-block to be emptied of all true meaning and to be denied the force of their context :

I am the LORD, and there is no other.
I form light and create darkness,
I make weal and create woe,
I am the LORD, who do all these things (Isa. xlv. 6, 7, R.S.V.)

We dare not at our peril seek to empty the teaching of the New Testament about the forces of evil of their meaning, but it is only the Old Testament that enables us to read them in their true context of the eternal sovereignty of God and so to hold them in balance.

Let this suffice. Whatever we do or do not find in the Old Testament, it is both the preparation for the Gospel message and the background against which and the framework within which our salvation was won. Hence its study will always throw new light on the implications of the Gospel and will afford the possibility of seeing all the details in due proportion. The fulfilment was infinitely higher than the foretelling, for it moves in a higher dimension, but for all that it conforms to the pattern and mould of the foretelling. It is only as we in measure understand the foretelling that we shall be able to stretch out to grasp " the length and breadth and depth and height, and know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge ".

NOTES

[1] This article is not taking sides in a vexed controversy beyond affirming that there is truth in *both* views : that the Church is in some sense the continuation of old Israel and that it is God's new creation in Christ.

[2] For convenience the Hebrew *torah*=instruction is represented by the traditional " law ".

[3] See P. Kahle : *Die Aussprache des Hebräischen in Vetus Testamentum* X, p. 385.

[4] *The Divine-Human Encounter*, p. 12.

[5] In *God who Acts*.

[6] *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, pp. 20f., 36.

[7] *op. cit.*, p. 110.

[8] This article must perforce look away from and ignore some of the aberrations caused by certain higher critical views.

[9] There is little evidence that Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew caused him to take a significantly different path.

The Scope of the Abrahamic Covenant

By Francis Andersen

THE Bible consists of two parts—the Old Testament and the New Testament. These indicate that God's dealings with mankind have taken the form of two successive covenants. The fact that God is revealed in both parts of the Bible as a covenant-making God confers a deep unity upon the whole book.

The events recorded in the Bible stand in a single historical process involving Israel as a nation, and as the bearers of a unique religion of which the Christian Church is an outgrowth. These confer a linguistic, a conceptual, a cultural unity on the Bible, a unity not obscured in the least by the long stretch of time, the diversity of literary materials, and the different languages found within its pages. But the unity we have particularly in view lies behind this unity of historical circumstance ; it lies in God, by whose providence these events were ordered and by whose superintendence this book was produced.

The unity of the Old and New Covenants lies deeper than the fact that they are successive stages of a single process. They are not called the first and second covenants as if they were unrelated (but compare Heb. x. 9). The New Covenant does not merely replace the Old, it supersedes it. Moreover, it is established with finality ; there is no hint of a third covenant yet to come.

The relation of the New Covenant to the Old is not one of succession but of growth—of fulfilment. As the New grows out of the Old and fulfils it, much that is in the Old is taken up and conserved. There is a continuity and discontinuity between Old and New which cannot be presented merely by listing similarities and differences between them. Things latent in the Old are perpetuated in the New, and while they are transformed in their new setting, they are not distorted ; rather do they come to their proper expression. The abundant quotations from the Old Testament in the New are sufficient proof of this fact. They are not simply put on top of the gospel to provide a decoration, being turned into interpretations alien to their original significance. The Christian use of Old Testament passages implies that the same God, who spoke before in various ways to the fathers, has now spoken in His Son, but the new message of Jesus the Christ consisted of "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come" (Acts xxvi. 22).

It is important to indicate clearly this integral quality of the Biblical revelation in order to safeguard the faithfulness of God. The Bible insists on the truthfulness of God in His self-disclosure, and on the consistency of His dealings with men. There is a genuine indication of the real character of God in all He has said and done. There is nothing arbitrary or changeable in His purposes. His covenants, then, embody the very essence of His relations with sinful mankind. This relationship is one of grace, displayed by God in the form of promises which He guarantees to execute, and which are fulfilled in redeeming acts. On its human side this relationship evokes faith, expressed

in truthful reliance upon God's mercy and steadfast obedience to His laws.

The covenant of grace then corresponds perfectly to God's nature and man's need. This fact is nowhere more strikingly affirmed than in Paul's claim that those who have faith in Jesus Christ are the children of Abraham (Rom. iv. 16; ix. 6-9; Gal. iii. 7, 9, 26, 29). The Old Testament promise of blessing for Abraham is called a "preaching of the Gospel" (Gal. iii. 8) and the message of Jesus Christ is reciprocally "the blessing of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 14).

In calling the promise made to Abraham "the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ" (Gal. iii. 17) Paul sees in the evolution of the covenant relationship a more complex development than the simple succession of Old Covenant—New Covenant at first suggests. It is not the Abrahamic covenant that is called Old. The inadequate arrangement that is to be superseded by the "new covenant" is the one made with the Israelites when they came out of Egypt (Jer. xxxi. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 6ff.). The fulfilment of the Law of Moses by Christ is a New Testament theme with many aspects, but it is part of Paul's analysis of it that the work of Christ brought to its full term the interim function of the law, which had been temporarily interposed between the giving of the original promise to Abraham and its fulfilment in Christ (Gal. iii. 17ff.; Rom. iv. 13-16), just as its ceremonial expression in circumcision came *after* the experience of justifying grace (Rom. iv. 9-12), and disappears with Christ (Gal. v. 2).

This does not mean that Paul regarded the Law as an interpolation, a parenthesis in an otherwise integral process. Far from it. On the contrary, Paul insists vehemently that any suggestion of a change in the economy of God's dealings with men is unthinkable. The law cannot possibly be against the promises of God (Gal. iii. 21). It is because God is one that faith does not make the law void (Rom. iii. 31). The work of Moses points directly to Christ (John v. 45ff.), and before and after him Abraham (John viii. 56) and Isaiah (John xii. 41) saw Him.

Abraham, Moses, and Christ do not stand in a series, but in a complex of which Christ is the living nexus. With fulfilment of the old economy in Christ both Abraham and Moses come into their own and are seen in their proper light.

The prominence given to Abraham in the New Testament is, then, not a merely Judaistic colouring of the Gospel due to no more than historical circumstances. It is a direct result of the Christian insistence on the unity of God and the unity of His dealings with men. The whole process of revelation and redemption is the disclosure and implementation of the covenant of Grace. The covenant with Abraham is more than an illustration or a type of the new Covenant in Christ's blood. More than analogy underlies Paul's allegorical comparisons in Gal. iv. 22-31 by which he concludes that Christians are the children of promise, like Isaac. The promise of life in Christ is not just *like* the promise made to Abraham; Christ *is* precisely that seed of Abraham to whom the promise was made (Gal. iii. 16). Whatever exegetical difficulties there may be in the subtle arguments Paul bases on the grammatically singular word "seed" (cf. Rom. ix. 8), the import is

clear—*the covenant made with Abraham is now seen to have no significance in itself independently of Christ.* Now that the purpose of God is fully disclosed, and the redeeming act of God is fully accomplished in Christ, a Jew can no longer rest on any guarantees of the blessing of God through the Abrahamic covenant, except through faith in Jesus as the Christ (Rom. ii. 28 ; x. 1-4). Paul's agonized analysis of the condition of this fellow-countrymen in Romans xi is circumscribed by his refusal to allow his " heart's desire for Israel " to hold out hope of a mode of salvation for them apart from the righteousness of faith in Christ.

* * * *

So far our discussion of the Christian significance of the Abrahamic covenant has depended heavily on Paul's treatment of the question. Other New Testament writers are in clear agreement with him, even though their approach and terminology are their own. From the very beginning of the Christian movement, the purpose of the " Lord God of Israel " in sending Jesus was understood to be :

> " To perform the mercy promised to our fathers,
> And to remember his holy covenant ;
> The oath which he sware to our forefather Abraham "
> (Zacharias : Luke i. 72f.).

> " He hath holpen his servant Israel
> In remembrance of his mercy,
> As he spake to our fathers,
> To Abraham, and to his seed for ever "
> (Mary : Luke i. 54f.).

These references are not to be dismissed as the remnants of Jewish nationalism to be left behind as Christianity grew to maturity.

From its very inception the Christian movement had already burst out from the bondage and limitations of contemporary Judaism, not by abandoning its Old Testament inheritance, but by bringing it to its proper exposition. Already in the preaching of John the Baptist a distinction is made between those who vainly rely upon their phsyical descent from Abraham and those who are raised up by the power of God (Matt. iii. 9 ; Luke iii. 8)—an oblique reference to the miraculous circumstances of Isaac's birth (?) ; but the connection is preserved, since it is precisely as children for Abraham that God can give life to dead stones.

If Paul emphasizes the faith of Abraham as the mark of his genuine children, Jesus emphasizes the complementary feature of " the works of Abraham " as the signs of His authentic seed (John viii. 33-41 ; cf. James iv. 21f.). Jesus concedes that His opponents are in a sense Abraham's seed (John viii. 37), but His words, " If you were Abraham's seed . . ."(verse 39), inply that there was a sense in which they were disqualified from this honour. It was not simply because they tried to kill Jesus. Behind this perversity lay a failure to recognize Jesus as " a man which hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God : this did not Abraham " (verse 40).

These examples are sufficient to permit us now to summarize the

main characteristics of the true followers of Jesus Christ who are also the true children of Abraham.

1. They exercise the faith of Abraham
2. They do the works of Abraham
3. They recognize Jesus as the one who brings the truth of God
4. They are raised up by the power of God.

These are the ones who come into Abraham's inheritance, and share it with him. Without us, Christian believers, Abraham himself remains spiritually incomplete (Heb. xi. 39f.). To be in paradise is to be gathered into Abraham's bosom (Luke xvi. 22); to enter the Kingdom of God is to come and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Luke xiii. 28).

Our Lord's words in John viii. 40 contrast the acts of Abraham with those of his natural descendants. They imply, moreover, that Abraham would (and John states explicitly that he *did*) recognize Jesus Christ as the object of his faith and the ground of his hope. It is entirely in line with this that Jesus deliberately names a crippled woman who was the object of His healing compassion " a daughter of Abraham " (Luke xiii. 16). And again in this incident there is a pointed contrast with those representatives of formalized and fleshly Judaism who objected to what Jesus was doing (verse 14). To these people Jesus states firmly and clearly that they will be excluded quite contrary to their expectation from the Kingdom of God in which people will come from all over the world to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (verses 24-30).

If we travel back to the story of Abraham with these New Testament passages at hand, the question arises as to whether the Christian interpretations are forced. Can the Church make good its claim to be the new Israel, the present sphere, and now the only sphere of the Abrahamic covenant? When the New Testament honours Abraham as " the father of us all " (Rom. iv. 16) are these merely the swaddling clothes of Judaism around the infant Church, of which it was hardly conscious, but betraying an incomplete liberation of a spiritual movement from the material background? The points are made, as we have seen, in a wide variety of New Testament contexts, where the matter has been thought out with such clarity, made so integral to Christian doctrine, and stated with such force, that it cannot be now discarded as incidental to our understanding of the ways of God.

Are the New Testament claims that Christians are the real heirs of Abraham merely an apologetic device, designed to conciliate the Jews —to make it easy for them to be converted to Christ without becoming disloyal to their national inheritance? The practical effectiveness of such a policy in relation to the evangelization of Jesus is not our concern here, since it is not a proper indication of the validity of the interpretations we are discussing. The New Testament hermeneutics will stand or fall (whether it is practically successful or not) by the test of its perspicuity in relation to the Old Testament passages being expounded. Has the New Testament brought the Abrahamic covenant to its proper expression, or has it distorted it?

This question cannot be settled by showing that Old Testament

materials reappear in the New Testament unchanged. This is not in fact what happened. The principle of organic development which we have already noted as binding the two parts of the Bible together does not lead us to expect it. The fruit need not resemble the root from which it is the proper outgrowth.

In applying this principle to the scope of the Abrahamic covenant, the similarities and differences observed between passages in Genesis and their exposition in Christian terms need to be related to the pattern of growth that connects Old Testament prophecies with New Testament fulfilment. The most striking similarities or constants are shown in those predictions which, in their plain and immediate sense, describe exactly the actual embodiment of the plan of God as it ultimately appeared in Christ. In the story of Abraham the best examples of this kind of thing are the promises that all the nations of the earth would be blessed in Abraham and in his seed (Gen. xii. 3). Whatever indirect benefits have come to mankind as a whole through the benefactions of the Israelite people—and a recollection of the fantastic achievements of Jews in the realm of science and culture will show that they are incalculable—this promise has never come in terms of Judaism to the fulfilment it has found in the Christian Church, overstepping all the bounds of race and nation, and going into all the world to preach the Gospel to every creature (Matt. xxviii. 19), to the Jew first, but also to the Gentile. Similarly we may say that the spiritual destiny of every man was defined from the first not in terms of descent from Abraham, or of membership in the Israelite nation, but in terms of his attitude of benediction or malediction to Abraham himself (Gen. xii. 3). Anyone who preceives that Abraham is the definitively blessed man will be " blessed with faithful Abraham ". The converse is also true. Abraham's faith became normative for saving faith universally, and this was made explicit from the beginning (Gen. xviii. 18f.).

* * * *

But other things in the story of Abraham are left out in the New Testament. These are matters related to the historical circumstances of his call, and some of a political kind. Here the most obvious is the promise that Abraham's descendants would receive the land of their sojournings (Canaan) as a gift from God (Gen. xiii. 14-17 ; xvii. 2-8) in perpetual possession (Gen. xiii. 15 ; xvii. 8). This has given the Israelite an undying hope which has been the direct cause of the rebirth of Israel as a nation on the very soil promised to Abraham nearly four thousand years ago, a phenomenon without parallel in the whole of human history ,and constituting such a striking agreement between event and biblical exhortation, that many readers of the Bible would suppose that God was talking to Abraham about the Modern Israeli State ! Are we to suppose then, that Israel remains a distinct entity in the purposes of God, pursuing its own proper destiny parallel to, but unrelated to the Church ? Are we interfering with the plan of God if we are not content to let the Jew alone, but try to convert him to Christ ?

There are several biblical passages which strongly suggest that this part of the Abrahamic covenant found only transient historical

expression. While, on the one hand the promises appear to be made unconditionally, there are other solemn warnings that they might forfeit the benefit of residence in Canaan by disobedience (Deut. xxviii. 15-68, for example). This does not mean that this part of the covenant would come to nothing. Far from it. The prophets who give warning of threatened deportation from Palestine also hold out hopes of redemption by restoration to the promised land. But in the New Testament such a matter is wholly spiritualized ; the land of promise is " a better heavenly city " (Heb. xi. 10, 16), a thought in line with Paul's teaching that Sarah, as the mother of us all, is " Jerusalem which is above " (Gal. iv. 26). The promised rest continues to remain, then, to the people of God and those who believe in Jesus enter into it (Heb. iv).

Similar considerations apply to the promise of numerous progeny. It found its historical fulfilment in the fact that Israel became a populous nation, and its spiritual fulfilment in the multitudes of all nations who learn through Christ that Abraham is their spiritual progenitor. Yet these two levels of interpretation interpenetrate, if only by an overlap of the two classes of descendants involved.

In the same way, that particular son about whom the promises spoke directly, that is, Isaac, and the seed of Abraham which is Christ, do not point to a double meaning (a historical and an allegorical) of a single expression, but to a complex of meaning. For Jesus was also the son of Abraham (Matt. i. 1) and Isaac was heir of the spiritual promises as one " born after the Spirit " (Gal. iv. 29), so that God became known as the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac (Gen. xxxi. 53 ; Exod. iii. 6, etc.).

The evangelical prophet preached his glad news by urging Israel to " look unto the rock whence ye are hewn " (Is. li. 1), that is, to Abraham. It was therefore proper that the first Christian believers should be Jews (Acts iii. 25) to whom the Gospel was preached in the words : " The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his son Jesus " (Acts iii. 13).

So, although " Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for " (Rom. xi. 7), " Israel . . . hath not attained to the law of righteousness " (Rom. ix. 31) ; " what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead ? " (Rom. xi. 15). " For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God " (Gal. vi. 15f.).

Adversus Judaeos: the Jews in History

By Jakob Jocz

THE worthy Editor of this Journal has requested "a historical survey of the fortunes of the Jews from A.D. 70 to the present time" to be put into 5,000 words. To compress 2,000 years of history in a short article is already a formidable task, but to compress *Jewish* history by allowing two-and-a-half words per annum is asking the impossible. We will thus confine ourselves to a bare outline of the strange vicissitudes comprising Jewish life in the diaspora.

It was said by an Irishman that the badge of a minority is suffering. Jewish history is an eminent illustration of this truth. The story of the Jewish people is an endless tale of cruel suffering. The explanation lies not only in the minority-existence of the Jews but also in the fact that Jews are a *peculiar* minority. Their peculiarity derives from the exclusiveness of their religion. Shakespeare grasped this fact when he lets Shylock say to Bassanio: "I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you . . ." (*Merchant of Venice*, Act I, sc. 2).

The religious separateness of the Jews from the rest of mankind largely accounts for the story of their woe. It was this that earned them the epithet of *odium generis humani*. To the pagan, as later to the Christian, the Jewish way of life was irritating if not sinister: the Jew would bring no sacrifices, worship no images, refuse to pay divine homage to the Emperor, refrain from eating with Gentiles, and associate only with his own kind: "If the Jews be citizens of Alexandria, why do not they worship the same gods with the Alexandrians?" asks Apion indignantly (Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, II, 6).

Tacitus accuses the Jews that "whilst among themselves they keep inviolate faith and are always prompt in showing compassion to their fellows, they cherish bitter enmity against all others, eating and lodging with one another only . . ." (*Hist.*, *V*, 5). J. G. Lipman remarks: "There is no doubt that it was the social and religious isolation of the Jews, and their contempt for the pagan beliefs, that gave birth to an enmity that has descended to more recent times" (*Jewish Encyclopædia*, Vol. IV, p. 109a).

1. Nonconformists

The price of being different entails suffering. In the past, however, the Jew accepted his lot, gladly giving his suffering an aura of martyrdom *al kiddush ha-Shem* (for the sanctification of God's Name). In more recent times, as a result of loss of religious conviction, suffering has largely lost for him its meaningfulness.

There is a proverb which says *homo homini lupus*—a man is unto man a wolf. Yet even wolves survive at the price of conforming to the habits of the pack. But the Jews found themselves on the horns

of a dilemma : to conform to the majority meant the end of Jewish existence ; to exist as Jews meant suffering. There is the poison of death in either solution. To this day this is the basic problem of Jewish history.

The fact that the Jewish people had chosen the more difficult path must fill the historian with awe and wonder when he realizes the price it entailed.

Jewish existence is non-conformist existence. In every land of his sojourn and in every age of his long exile, he differed from the rest. He remained a stranger in Babylon, in Persia, in Syria ; he was an outsider under the Eagle, the Cross, and the Crescent.

Nonconformity has an irritating, exasperating effect upon the majority. There is a deep-seated psychological need to press the nonconformist to conform. Much of missionary zeal, unfortunately, is mere human intolerance. Under the pressure of public opinion and frequent coercive acts, many Jews conformed, but the core of Jewry held out. Jewish survival is nothing but a miracle. But only those who know the story can appreciate this fact.

It must not be forgotten that the major disaster which befell Jewry in A.D. 70 had a religious background. The Jews felt it an intolerable insult to be dominated by a pagan power. Josephus gives as the *casus belli* the abolishment of the customary sacrifices offered at the Temple in Jerusalem for Rome and Cæsar. Jerusalem fell on Sept. 25th, A.D. 70, after a bitter siege which lasted five months. Josephus estimates that more than one and a quarter million people perished in Jerusalem alone. Between May 1st and July 20th, 150,880 corpses were carried out through one single gate. Some 600,000 bodies were cast unburied from the walls ; 97,000 Jews were brought as slaves to the Roman capital. The markets were flooded with Jewish slaves all over the empire. There was such a glut of slaves as a result of the Jewish war that they almost were given away.

The Jews, smarting under defeat, were seeking opportunities of revenge. In the year A.D. 115 Trajan was engaged in a campaign against the Parthians. The Jews used the occasion to revolt and the Jewries of Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia became involved in civil war against Rome. Under Hadrian it came to a final show down, which ended disastrously with the fall of Bethar on the 9th of Ab A.D. 135 (to this day the 9th of Ab is commemorated as the anniversary of the Fall of the second Temple). The leader of the revolt Shimon Bar-Coziba, who was declared by the leading rabbi of the day as God's Messiah, fell in battle, and with him 500,000 perished.

It is now that the story begins in earnest. The Jews never recovered from the " Bar-Cochba " *débâcle*. The Christianization of the Empire only added a new element to the strained relations between Gentiles and Jews. The Jews were now looked upon not only as a conquered people but as a religious enemy. Constantine had already introduced restrictions upon the synagogue. Further measures were taken by his successors to curtail Jewish freedom. Valentinian, Gratian, Theodosius, Honorius, all added to the restrictions which served as the basis for the complete legal disfranchise of Jewry in the Middle Ages. By the second half of the twelfth century we find the Jews in the

position of *servi camerae*, that is, the private property of the reigning prince. Jews could be sold, pawned, lent, or even killed without redress.

It is only natural that finding himself in a legal vacuum, the Jew should become the butt of contempt amidst a fanatical and barbarous population. He had to live in segregation for his own protection and engage in pursuits which only added to his unpopularity.

As far as Christian Europe is concerned the story of Jewish martyrdom can be summarized under three headings :

(a) *Baptism or expulsion*

This alternative the Jews had to face with tedious regularity. The motives of those who put the Jews before such a choice were prompted by selfishness ; only seldom was it the result of religious zeal. Expulsion of the Jews was of the greatest possible advantage to debtors and local merchants. But to the Jews, either choice spelled financial ruin, for there was a law which required of Jewish " converts " the forfeiture of their possessions or the greater part of them on the principle that, prior to baptism, all gain was sinfully obtained.

On some rare occasions the alternative to baptism was not expulsion but death. Such was particularly the case during the period of the Crusades. Those were times of bitter suffering for Jews in Europe.

It was a frequent occurrence for Jews to commit suicide rather than abjure their faith, as they did in London at the advice of their Rabbi, Jacob of Orleans, during the massacre at the time of the coronation of Richard I. The pious writer of the *Chronicles of William of Newbury* comments upon these events: " Thus was the first day of the reign of the illustrious King Richard distinguished by an even hitherto unheard of in the royal city, by the beginning of the doom of the infidel race, and by a new zeal of Christians against the enemies of the Cross of Christ."

The classical example of expulsion was that from Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella. The moment the fatal edict was signed on March 30th, 1492, the clergy immediately started a great campaign to " convert " the obstinate Jews. The story of the Marranos is one of the saddest chapters in Church history.

(b) *Forced baptism of Jewish children*

This is one of the ugliest chapters in the Church's dealing with the Jews. It would sometimes happen that an over-zealous fanatical nurse would clandestinely baptize a Jewish infant and then confess to the priest. Once the story became known to the Church the child was claimed on the grounds of the efficacy of the sacrament. " A mock ceremony," writes Cecil Roth, " performed with ditch water by a superstitious nurse or a drunken ruffian " was sufficient to deprive the parents of all claims to the child unless they themselves accepted the Christian faith. This was not an unusual occurrence in the Middle Ages and even happened in more recent times. There is the case of Edgaro Mortara of Bologna who was abducted by the Papal Guards at 10 o'clock at night on June 23rd, 1858, when six years old, on the grounds that he was baptized by his nurse in infancy. In spite of

frantic efforts on the part of the parents, supported by the Jewish community and world opinion, the child was never surrendered. Edgaro ultimately became a priest and joined the Augustinian Order. The Finaly case which arose out of the Nazi persecution brings us to our own time and generation. Dr. Fritz Finaly and his wife were arrested by the Gestapo in La Tronche, a suburb of Grenoble in France, in 1944. They left their two boys, Robert aged two and Gerald, aged one, in the keeping of a Catholic orphanage. The parents perished at the hands of the Germans, but the sister of Dr. Finaly entered proceedings to gain possession of the children. After a long legal struggle the children were surreptitiously removed and hidden in a school on the Spanish border under assumed names. When finally discovered they were again spirited across the border and passed from hand to hand. Only after an order by the Supreme Court were the children returned to their Jewish relatives. A Roman Catholic writer reviewing the case saw in it an " irreducible conflict between civil law and certain incontestable superior right " (cf. *The Bridge*, A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies, I, 1955, p. 300). Such a conflict is only possible to a medieval mind.

(c) *Mob violence*

The Jews were unpopular for a number of reasons : they were different in their habits ; they engaged in pursuits which were held in derision ; they kept aloof from the rest of the population ; they did not conform religiously. They were also defenceless, as is every other minority. Defencelessness invites attack, especially when it can be done with impunity. Mob violence was thus a common experience in Jewish history. In case we are led to believe that Jew-bating was a " Christian " prerogative, it is as well to be reminded that the Jewish lot in non-Christian lands was equally precarious.

When Mohammed's followers gained the upper hand after the victory at Badr in 624, the Jewish communities became the first victims. The Jews of Medina were attacked without warning and driven into exile ; gradually other Jewish tribes were " assaulted and in most cases either expelled, exterminated, or forced to embrace Islam ", writes Cecil Roth in his *Short History of the Jewish People* (1936, p. 147).

The era of the Crusades, and later the Black Death, were periods of indescribable Jewish misery. They were accused of witchcraft, the use of Christian blood for ritual purposes, the poisoning of wells, the desecration of the Host, and every other crime imaginable. The result was constant massacre, rape, and pillage.

In Slav countries Jewish suffering persisted to our own days and they are still the seed-bed of anti-Semitism. The term *pogrom* has entered our vocabulary and is of Ukrainian provenance. Though the Oxford Dictionary politely describes *pogrom* as " organized massacre of a body or class in Russia ", its historic reference is primarily to Jews.

Since the Cossack rising under Pavluk (1637) and Bogdan Khmelnicki (1648-49) in the Ukraine, there was almost no respite for the Jewish population in Eastern Europe. Here is the witness of a Russian historian quoted by S. M. Dubnow in his *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland* : " Killing was accompanied by barbarous tortures ; the

victims were flayed alive, split asunder, clubbed to death, roasted on coals, or scalded with boiling water. Even infants at the breast were not spared. The most terrible cruelty was shown to the Jews. They were destined to utter annihilation, and the slightest pity shown to them was looked upon as treason . . ." (Vol. I, 1916, pp. 145f.).

Jew-baiting continued in the Russian empire to the very last. At the end of the nineteenth century as the Czar's throne was tottering, anti-Semitism became the official policy of the Russian Government. It is now universally accepted that the worst excesses against Jews were organized by government agents. Since the assassination of Alexander II in March 1881, anti-Jewish propaganda became an important factor in Russian politics. It was believed that by using the Jew as a scapegoat the wrath of the nation would be diverted from the ruling classes. Professor Dubnow, who lists the pogroms in alphabetical order according to cities, gives instances of pogroms " carefully prepared by Government agents ". His listing runs to several pages. The Russian police was heavily implicated in these excesses which cost the Jewish people thousands of lives. These pogroms started an exodus to the West on the part of Russian Jewry which was only halted by the outbreak of war in 1914.

In other Eastern European lands the Jewish lot was not less bitter. Poland was the scene of sustained anti-Semitism. Dubnow says that " the *furor Polonicus* assumed more and more dangerous forms, so that at the beginning of the World War in 1914, almost the entire Polish nation, from the ' progressive anti-Semites ' down to the clericals, were up in arms against the Jews ". After the Poles regained their freedom in 1918 the Jewish position underwent little change. In 1939 when Hitler invaded Poland he found willing and even eager co-operators in the annihilation of Polish Jewry. It is a bitter fact that while Polish Jewry was being systematically destroyed, the Church looked on without raising a single voice in protest. Anti-Semitism is almost a dogma in the Polish Church. The same can be said of the other neighbouring countries, specially Hungary and Roumania.

2. The Inferior Race

Anti-Semitism from a semantic point of view is a modern concept. Ancient Jew-baiting rested upon different premises. For the ancient Roman the Jew was an atheist who denied the gods ; for the Crusader he was the Christ-killer who refused to repent ; for the Muslim he was the infidel who rejected his Prophet. For the medieval Christian the Jew was the man under God's curse in association with the sinister powers of the Devil. There may have been hidden racial prejudices which determined the medieval Christian's attitude towards the Jews but he was not aware of them. Judaeophobia on racial grounds is a modern creation.

The theory of anti-Semitism derives from France and is associated with the name of Ernest Renan. The great French historian was not an anti-Semite in the vulgar sense. All he did was to define the Semites as inferior, when compared with the Aryan race. He did not even regard the modern Jew as a Semite and denied that the Jewish people constitutes a race. But the seed he sowed soon bore fruit upon

German soil which became the hot-bed of anti-Semitism. The literary father of the movement was an obscure German journalist by the name of Wilhelm Marr. He described the Jews not only as blood-sucking leeches, but the sworn enemies of the Germanic race. Adolf Stöcker, the court chaplain and Conservative member of the Prussian Diet, gave respectability to the anti-Semitic movement. A flood of anti-Semitic literature filled the country. The political situation in Germany provided the proper soil for anti-Semitic sentiment as it served to strengthen national unity—the main aim of the Bismarck régime.

The theory of the supremacy of the Aryan race was elaborated by the Frenchman, Count Gobineau, and received a degree of philosophical, if not anthropological, support from men like Schopenhauer, Feuerbach, Dühring, and Nietzsche. Treitschke, the historian, gave a special anti-Semitic twist to historical studies. G. F. Abbott in his *Israel in Europe* (1907), says about Germany : " German professors analysed the Jewish mind and found it Semitic, German theologians sought for the Jewish soul and could find none. Both classes, agreeing in nothing else, concurred in denouncing the Jew as a sinister creature, strangely wanting of spiritual qualities—a being whose whole existence, devoid of faith of any kind, revolves between his cash-book and the book of the Law " (p. 419).

October 1879 was the date of the first anti-Jewish society in Berlin and Dresden with the objective of uniting " all non-Jewish Germans of all persuasions, all parties, all stations, into one common league . . . to save our German fatherland from becoming completely Judaized . . . . " The German League passed a resolution " to eschew all intercourse, social and commercial, with the enemies of the Teutonic race " (G. F. Abbott, *Israel in Europe*, p. 422), and in April 1888 presented a petition to the Prussian Chamber requesting the deportation of all foreign Jews; the exclusion of Jews from posts of authority; the removal of Jewish influence from Christian schools, etc.

It is odd to contemplate the fact that German anti-Semitism which began with the purpose of defending Christianity and was sustained by the most conservative elements of the Protestant and Roman Churches, ended as a bitter foe of the Christian faith. The logic of this fact is only too apparent : vilification of the " semitic " spirit consequently led to the vilification of the Bible and of Jesus Christ himself. The prophets of naked anti-Christian racialism were Friedrich Nietzsche, Houstan Stewart Chamberlain, and Alfred Rosenberg, the racial theorist of the Nazi party and the sometime editor of the *Völkischer Beobachter*. The faith of Nazism is summarized in a few words : " The struggle for existence is a law of Nature ; hardness is the supreme virtue ; the key to history lies in race; power is the prerogative of a racial élite. There is the old scorn for the Christian virtues, dismissed as the attempt of the underdog to impose shackles on the strong . . . there is the old hatred of the Jew as the eternal enemy of Aryan ' culture ' and the Germanic peoples " (Alan Bullock, *Hitler, A Study in Tyranny*, 1952, pp. 615f.).

With such a philosophy of life, all that the Germans needed was the opportunity to translate theory into practice. The opportunity came

at the outbreak of the Second World War. Lord Russell of Liverpool, who acted as assistant judge advocate at the trials of war criminals in Germany, quotes the Nazi Journal *Das Schwarze Korps*, in which the German aim regarding the Jews is bluntly stated : " Just as the Jewish question will be solved in Germany only when the last Jew has gone ; so the rest of Europe must realize that the German peace which awaits it must be a peace without Jews " (Lord Russell, *The Scourge of the Swastika*, 1954).

Wherever the Germany army went it remained true to its purpose—the destruction of the Jewish people. We quote Lord Russell again, who like few others, knows the story from the inside. Here is his account in carefully chosen and measured words : " Their women could be violated with immunity, their places of worship desecrated and set on fire. Their shops were looted and executions began. Jew hunts were organized and when rabbis were caught, their beards were cut or torn off. The Jews were made to perform the filthiest and most degrading tasks ; to clean out latrines with their hands ; to collect horse-droppings in the street and fill their caps and pockets with them."

But all these humiliations were only a prelude to the last act in the drama : the moment the Germans began to invade Russia the *Einsatzkommandos* were organized ; these were special units to exterminate the Jewish population. At first the victims were shot after they were made to dig their own graves, but in the spring of 1942 the Main Office in Berlin supplied mobile gas vans for mass extermination. When these vans were unable to cope with the numbers destined to be destroyed, the gas ovens in the concentration camps were introduced.

Lord Russell, with typical Anglo-Saxon restraint, tells of the tragic end of Polish Jewry : " From the statistics available it would appear that the total annihilation ordered by Himmler in 1942 was almost accomplished. Of the 3,000,000 or more Jews living in Poland in September, 1939, not more than 50,000 could be traced in 1946, and not less than 2,600,000 perished."

These fantastic figures do not, however, convey the whole extent of the tragedy. According to Alan Bullock's report the total picture is much more staggering. Bullock records that in August, 1944, Eichmann, Himmler's infamous assistant, soon to be tried in Israel, reported the extermination of 4,000,000 in the various camps ; an additional 2,000,000 to have been shot by the *Einsatzkommandos* of the Security Police in Russia. Himmler disputed the report and insisted that more than 6,000,000 had perished. He even proposed to send an S.S. statistician to overhaul Eichmann's records (cf. Bullock, *op. cit.*, p. 643).

European Jewry emerged from the holocaust decimated and bleeding. " Decimated " is hardly the word, for it was not one in ten who suffered death, but barely one in ten who escaped. Of Polish Jewry about 50,000 survived. Of German Jewry only a handful survived, except those who were fortunate enough to leave the country before 1939. Hungary, Roumania, Holland, Belgium, and France, all suffered grievous loss. The first victims in every country invaded by the Germans or under German influence, were the Jewish communities.

In the East of Europe, Himmler found willing henchmen among the Ukrainian, Poles, Roumanians, and Lithuanians in hunting, pillaging, and shooting the Jewish population. When we speak of German guilt we frequently forget the many willing helpers of non-German origin who have been reared in the tradition of Jew-baiting and whose hands have become stained with Jewish blood.

In terms of personal suffering the full story can never be told. A glimpse of what happened to people hunted like wild animals and in constant danger for their lives we receive from reading *The Diary of Anne Frank*. Those who miraculously survived the holocaust to tell the story have frequently found it impossible to express the depths of despair and degradation. There is a growing literature of reminiscences and evidence of those frightful years. There is a book by Belsen survivors containing twenty-four articles on different aspects of conditions in the camp. There is the autobiography of Gerda Weissman Klein, *All But My Life*, which gives a fairly good idea what it meant for a girl of fifteen to become a Nazi slave. There is the gruesome novel by the Polish author Jerzy Andrzejewski called *Noc* ("Night", 1946). There is the hair-raising account of Ravensbruck concentration camp by Sylvia Salvesen, *Forgive—But Do Not Forget*. There is the incredible story of the rising of the Warsaw Ghetto and the tragic end of the imprisoned Jewish community (cf. the article by the Polish writer Adolf Rudnicki, written on the fifteenth anniversary of the destruction of the Ghetto (*Jewish Chronicle*, April 18, 1958). There is the moving, haunting story of a noble and stout-hearted woman, Mrs. Grete Salus, who survived in a labour camp in Germany—*Eine Frau erzäht* (*Das Parlament*, Oct. 30, 1957, Bonn). There are thousands of other books and documents, but one book still awaits a writer. We need somebody, preferably a Christian theologian, to tell us the implications, inferences, and effects of what happened to European Jewry in the midst of the twentieth century, and perpetrated by a modern, highly-dustrialized and "civilized" people. Such a writer will also have to explain to us the miracle of Jewish survival in spite of persistent efforts to destroy this people. He will also have to help us understand the meaning of Jewish destiny and the significance of their national renaissance.

* * * *

The present writer has just returned from a visit to Israel. For three exhilarating weeks he went up and down the country speaking to people, visiting biblical sites, observing the miraculous transformation of the country. He saw this "inferior people" building schools, erecting the new university in Jerusalem, draining swamps, planting trees in the desert. But above all he saw a new generation of Jews being raised in freedom, fearless, uninhibited, and disciplined. He repeatedly asked himself the question : What is the future of this people ? The Jews have seen Hitler's rise and fall, and, as Dean Inge observed, have always stood at the grave of their persecutors. Is there meaning in Jewish history ? Is there a pattern woven into the strange vicissitudes of Israel, though invisible to the human eye ?

These are not theoretical questions but questions which press upon us when we contemplate upon Israel's pilgrimage through time. Some-

what similar questions could be asked about any people in any period of history, but in no case are these questions more puzzling, more insistent, more urgent, than when face to face with the Jews.

The writer only knows of one answer but it is an answer of faith : Jesus Christ, " a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of His people Israel ". For a crucified people need the message of Easter Day.

Is there a Future for the Jews?

By George Stevens

FROM the purely secularist point of view the question of a possible future for the Jewish people is bound up with the prospects of the survival of the human race as a whole. The development of nuclear weapons has placed a gigantic question mark against the whole future of humanity and recently such secular " prophets " as Bertrand Russell and Philip Noel-Baker have given expression to views of extreme pessimism in the matter. Bertrand Russell has said he considers there is a fifty-fifty chance that any human life will remain upon this planet in a hundred years' time. Noel-Baker has been still more pessimistic stating that the most probable future of the planet is to be a lifeless, radio-active mass rotating in space.

Leaving these dismal and terrifying possibilities on one side the likelihood of the Jewish race surviving as a separate entity may be argued on the basis of probabilities arising from past history. The fact that the Jewish people have shown an astonishing genius for survival, the fact that, in Disraeli's oft-quoted words, the Jew has time and time again stood at the graveside of his persecutors, might well make it seem likely that they will successfully withstand any further ordeals the future may have in store for them. Moreover, there is now for the first time for nearly two thousand years a Jewish state in existence in part of the ancient fatherland. Although the position of the State of Israel, surrounded as it is by hostile and suspicious nations, may well be regarded as precarious in the extreme, yet, in the opinion of an increasing number of unbiased observers, it has come to stay. If this is so that State would almost certainly provide a refuge for many potential victims of a future " Hitler " and therefore the likelihood of the entire people being exterminated is proportionately reduced. Thus, if the human race as a whole survives, it may be said that having regard to its past history and its present prospects the Jewish race is likely to survive at least in the foreseeable future.

Can the continued existence of the Jewish people, however, be explained on purely secular, materialistic lines? There is certainly something unique about their history. This was recently well expressed

by David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel. Addressing a large Zionist gathering he referred to the disappearance of the ancient culture of Egypt, Babylon, Syria, and Canaan and went on to say : " It is only in one corner of the Middle East, in Israel, that there lives a people speaking the language spoken by its fathers four thousand years ago, maintaining the literature created by its prophets and sages in those far-off days, and thus preserving an unbroken tradition almost four thousand years old, although it is heir to all the modern achievements of science and technology, and has absorbed all the heritage of modern culture. Why has nothing survived of all these nations but inscriptions, tels, ruins, and temple remains, while their language, literature, and religions have vanished from the face of the earth, while the Jewish people alone has preserved the power, after thousands of years, to ingather its scattered sons and help them to strike new roots in its ancient homeland while maintaining its bond with modern culture ? "

Why indeed ? Most Christians would agree that only in the pages of the Bible are we likely to find the answer. In fact, the very existence of the Jewish people may be regarded as one of the most effective replies that can be offered to the suggestion that blind chance and purely material, contingent causes determine the course of human history.

This is borne out by three very different, yet each in his way representative Christian writers of our time.

Thus Karl Barth, the great Continental Protestant theologian has described the continued existence of the Jews as " the only possible natural proof of the existence of God."

Nicholas Berdyaev, the Russian Orthodox thinker, has described how as a young man he determined to test the materialistic interpretation of history by applying it to the records of one nation after another. He found that it broke down completely in the case of the Jewish people and it was this more than anything else which began to shake his faith in the Marxist interpretation of history.

Similarly, Jacques Maritain, the French Roman Catholic writer, feels compelled to speak of the " Mystery of Israel ", a mystery which he compares to the " Mystery of the Church ", something that is totally inexplicable in purely human terms. These modern writers recall the medieval Court Chaplain who, on being asked by his royal master for a proof of the existence of God and the truth of the Scriptures in two words, is said to have replied : " The Jews, your Majesty, the Jews ".

* * * *

Once we accept the biblical revelation of God's creation of the world and man upon it, the purpose of God for the Jewish race takes its place as part of the purpose of God for humanity. The survival or otherwise of mankind is no longer a matter of chance nor is it merely dependent on the degree of man's stupidity and wickedness ; it rests ultimately upon the sovereign will of an All-Wise God. The Bible never suggests that human history will go on for ever and, as the Archbishop of Canterbury said a few years ago, it is conceivable that God might allow a misuse of atomic energy to ring down the curtain when the drama of human history is over. The one thing that is

certain is that it will not happen by chance. If, then, we have reason to believe that there is a future for humanity because God's purpose for the human race is not yet exhausted we may answer the question " Is there a future for the Jews ? " in the affirmative, merely because they form a part of the human family.

More than this, however, is generally intended when the question is asked. Other questions are invariably involved. Have the Jews a special assurance of survival as Jews ? Are they still in any special sense the " chosen people " of God ? Can the idea of a chosen people still be maintained today, and even if they were at one time " chosen " have they not long since forfeited all right to be regarded as the people of God ? All these and a number of similar and closely related questions require to be examined in the light of the biblical revelation.

There can be no doubt that the idea of a " chosen people " is extremely repugnant to the modern mind. It savours of favouritism and thus to many minds seems to suggest an unworthy and sub-Christian conception of God. This is part at least of what is sometimes spoken of as " the scandal of particularity ". Men may say : " How odd of God to choose the Jews ", but they really think it would be extremely odd of Him to choose anyone at all !

Yet, whether we like it or not, there can be no doubt that the principle of choice, or " election ", to use the more technical and still more unpopular word, runs throughout the whole of the Bible and is just as prominent in the New Testament as in the Old. In fact the entire drama of the Bible may be said to be based upon this principle.

In the book of Genesis we see the beginning of the Divine purpose. Man is created in the image of God : that is to say, endowed with reason and real, not imaginary, free-will. This involves the enormous risk of his abusing this gift which is what actually happened. Man fell, preferring his own way to the way of God and thus " Paradise " was " lost ".

Immediately, however, after the account of man's fall in Genesis iii, we have the clear statement of God's intention to put matters right : " I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel " (Gen. iii. 15). Thus we see the familiar pattern developing. God endows man with free-will. Man abuses the gift. God does not prevent him since that would mean withdrawing the gift. Rather he intervenes to repair the result and, whether we like it or not, he does so through a chosen people. Israel is to be the instrument of God's redemptive work.

In Genesis we see the line narrowing through Noah, the pioneer of a new beginning after the deluge, through Shem to Abraham. The call of Abraham may be regarded as the beginning of the history of the chosen people of God, as in fact the Jews do regard it to this day. The important thing to notice is that Abraham was called and chosen. In the biblical account God takes the initiative. We are not told that in the city of Ur of the Chaldees there lived one particularly lofty and exalted soul who, by a long process of philosophical reasoning and mystical contemplation, eventually came to a far higher conception of the Divine reality than most of his contemporaries. That is, no

doubt, how a modern humanist might attempt to rewrite the twelfth chapter of Genesis. The Bible, however, states quite plainly : " The Lord had said unto Abram, ' Get thee out from thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house unto a land that I will shew thee '."

The words of the promise made to Abraham at the time of his call are still treasured by the Jewish people and many of them would no doubt regard them as a guarantee of their survival. The Christian, however, may well feel that the deepest significance of the words eludes the Jew until he comes to a knowledge of Christ. " I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great ; and thou shalt be a blessing, And I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed " (Gen. xii. 1-3).

The promise made to Abraham was repeated to Isaac his son and Jacob his grandson, and the principle of election was confirmed by the choice of Jacob rather than Esau to be the head of the new and chosen nation. Jacob, later called Israel, had twelve sons, the fathers of the twelve tribes. By the time of the death of Jacob they were already a separate people, through a curious but divinely-overruled twist of circumstances, living in Egypt where they became a nation of slaves. According to the biblical record, a deliberate and systematic attempt to exterminate them was made by the Egyptians who ordered all male infants of Hebrew birth to be drowned in the Nile. The attempt did not succeed, however, and in the providence of God the nation was rescued from slavery under the hand of Moses, the chosen deliverer and leader.

It is the great deliverance of his fathers from the land of Egypt under Moses that the Jew celebrates on Passover night, and the traditional language of the feast emphasizes its importance as a guarantee of the future survival of Israel. " At present we celebrate it here, but next year (we hope to celebrate it) in the Land of Israel. This year we are servants (aliens) but next year (we hope to be) sons of freedom ". " Hitherto Thy tender mercies have supported us and Thy kindness hath not forsaken us. O Lord, our God ! Thou wilt not forsake us in future " (Passover *Hagadah*). As John Newton sings in his old hymn : " His love in time past forbids me to think He'll leave me at last in trouble to sink ". It is not difficult to realize the strength and encouragement these words of the ancient *Hagadah* have brought to the Jewish people in times of bitter persecution, not least in our own times when the Passover was eaten in secret during the days of the Nazi attempt at extermination.

The Jew believes himself to belong to the covenant people, the people with whom God has entered into a solemn covenant ratified by blood as described in Exodus xxiv, verses 1 to 11. It may, however, be objected that Israel has broken her side of the Covenant, which is therefore invalidated. As her part of the Covenant Israel promised : " All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient " (Exod. xxiv. 7). Even before the time of Christ Israel had broken her side of the Covenant, as her own prophets were not slow to point out : " Which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith

the Lord " (Jer. xxxi. 32). Yet, even if Israel has been faithless, God is the Other Party to the Covenant, and He has remained faithful. Thus, it is argued, Israel still remains the people of the Covenant because of the faithfulness of God.

* * * *

So far we have suggested that the greatest guarantee of a future for the Jews lies in the fact that they are a chosen people who have been preserved by God despite many human attempts to destroy them, because His purposes for them are not yet complete. Here, however, some will certainly answer : " Granted that they were chosen by God in days gone by, have they not been cast off and rejected because of their failure to recognize Jesus Christ as the true Messiah and to believe in Him ? Is there not a new Covenant which has superseded the old ? Is not the Church the New Israel, and when we speak of the Jews as the ' ancient people ' of God, do we not mean the ' former people ' ? "

Two things may be said at once in reply to this contention. First, it is strange that any believer in the New Testament should speak in this way in view of St. Paul's very definite words in Rom. xi. 1 : " I say then, hath God cast away His people ? God forbid . . . God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew." At present, although the majority of the nation have " stumbled " and " fallen ", there is still " a remnant according to the election of grace " (Rom. xi. 5). Moreover, even of the majority, this " stumbling " was not to be in order that they might finally fall.

St. Paul's explanation is as follows. Their " stumbling " has been permitted in order that the Gentiles may receive the message of salvation. This was true in St. Paul's own missionary experience. Having gone invariably " to the Jew first " if, in any particular place the Jews refused to listen to the Gospel, he then, and only then, went to the Gentiles. A good example is in Acts xiii. 46 : " It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you (i.e., Jews), but seeing ye put it from you . . . lo, we turn to the Gentiles ". This passage has sometimes been used to suggest that henceforth Paul gave up the Jews as hopeless. That this is not the case, however, can be clearly seen from Acts xiv. 1, where we find Paul and Barnabas again going first to the synagogue in Iconium where, incidentally, there were numbers of conversions among both Jews and Gentiles.

St. Paul, in his parable of the wild and natural branches of the olive tree (Rom. xi. 17-24), warns Gentile Christians not to boast presumptuously against the Jews—a warning that has, alas, often been ignored in Christian history. Furthermore, he looks forward to a final restoration of Israel which is going to bring blessings to the whole world far greater than those obtained by their fall : " Now if the fall of them (i.e., the Jews) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles ; how much more their fulness ? . . . For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead ? " (Rom. xi. 12 and 15). Gentile Christians, it would seem, are to be humbly grateful that, as a result of the defection of the Jewish majority, they have been privileged to share in a spiritual sense, in the promises made to Abraham.

Further, they are to look forward to a time when the barrier between Jew and Gentiles will be finally broken down, the Jews as a people shall come to acknowledge Christ and Jews and Gentiles will be at one in Him : " Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved " (Rom. xi. 25, 26). The last clause has sometimes been thought to promise the ultimate salvation of every individual Jew, an idea which has tended to blunt the keen edge of missionary endeavour among Jews. It would seem rather to mean that the entire Israel, the whole people of God, Jew and Gentile, natural and wild olive branches alike, will finally be one in Christ. Despite much popular modern talk (particularly in certain Anglican theological circles) the New Testament never speaks of a " new Israel ", a phrase often applied today to the Church. Always there is one Israel, one chosen people of God, though through His infinite mercy, Gentiles as well as Jews, spiritual as well as physical descendants of Abraham, have been brought into it. The keynote would seem to be St. Paul's words in Rom. xi. 29 : " The gifts and calling of God are without repentance ". God does not abandon His ancient people, no matter how faithless some of them may have been to Him. The survival of Israel is thus inextricably bound up with the faithfulness of God.

There is indeed a new Covenant, sealed by Our Lord with His own life-blood, of which He spoke in the upper room : " After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood " (1 Cor. xi. 25). The parties to the New Covenant are God, the same unchanging God who made the old covenant with Moses, though now more fully revealed in Christ, and all, be they Jews or Gentiles, who by faith are children of Abraham. None of this, however, can contradict the firm declaration that God has not cast away His people.

* * * *

There remain two further questions to be considered. Has the present return of many Jews to a part of the ancient land anything to do with God's special purpose for Israel, and, if it is admitted that the Jewish people are being preserved for a special purpose, have we any clue as to what that purpose may be ?

The questions are far from easy, for they involve the interpretation of prophecy and this is a notoriously difficult subject. There are, of course, those who accept as a guiding principle that prophecy must always refer to its own time or at most to the very near future. It is difficult to see, however, how this position is reconcilable with any view of the Scriptures which regards them as authoritative and inspired. If the Gospels give us anything like a trustworthy picture of our Lord, there can be no doubt that He regarded Himself as in some sense fulfilling the prophecies of the Old Testament. Even of Moses, according to the Fourth Evangelist, He said : " He wrote of me " (John v. 46) ; and to the disciples on the road to Emmaus we are told that the Risen Christ, " beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself " (Luke xxiv. 27). There would seem to be therefore no good reason for

abandoning the traditional position that the prophet was enabled, by the inspiration of God, to look beyond the confines of his own time and situation and speak of events far distant to him, and probably therefore beyond his own comprehension, but already, of course, within the purpose and knowledge of Almighty God. There is, therefore, nothing intrinsically absurd in supposing that there are passages of Scripture which will find their ultimate fulfilment in events which are contemporary to us or still future. This is worth saying because an opposite conclusion is often arrived at without much discrimination as being the only position that can be considered intellectually respectable.

At the same time, specific " futuristic " interpretations of prophecy must be accepted with extreme caution in view of their diverse and often contradictory character. British Israelites, Jehovah's Witnesses, Christadelphians, and Seventh-Day Adventists all claim to base their doctrines upon a particular interpretation of prophetical Scripture, quite apart from many who would wish to be regarded as orthodox Christians but who hold views that are not accepted by the majority of their fellow-Christians.

Having said all this, however, it must be admitted that there is a very general consensus of opinion among all who accept a futurist element in biblical prophecy at all that the Holy Scriptures do foretell a return of the Jewish people to their own land before the Second Advent of Christ. Nor is this view confined to Christians. It is held by many devout Jews also (without, of course, reference to Jesus Christ). It is considerations of this sort that led so sound a scholar as Dr. M. A. C. Warren to speak recently of " the profound mystical significance of Palestine for the religious Jews ".

On what, then, is this conviction of an eventual return as part of the revealed purpose of God based ?

First, on the belief that the Promised Land is part of the pledge given by God to Abraham. In Gen. xiii. 14, 15 we read : " And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward : for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever ". In Gen. xv. 17-21, in the course of a description given of the solemn covenant into which God entered with Abraham, the boundaries are defined as " from the river of Egypt unto the great river the river Euphrates ", though so much territory has never yet been occupied by the children of Israel. It is further maintained that the language makes it clear that the promise is " for ever " and thus unconditional, though there are certain conditions for continuous habitation of the land which have not been fulfilled. As a result the people may be scattered and the land left desolate or occupied by the heathen for long periods, but ultimately God will remember His covenant and gather His people again (Lev. xxvi. 30-44).

Further, there are many passages in the Old Testament which speak of the ingathering of the scattered people of Israel, and it is claimed that these were by no means completely fulfilled by the return from Babylon. Finally, much is made of the prophecies of Zechariah which,

it is claimed, are at all events too late to refer to the partial return. Zechariah also speaks of Jerusalem as a spiritual centre for all nations and of the Jews as fulfilling their ancient role as interpreters of God to the nations of the world. This hope is expressed in a remarkable passage (Zech. viii. 22, 23) which it is claimed has not yet been fulfilled : " Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem and to pray before the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you : for we have heard that God is with you ". What are we to make of this and other similar passages, e.g., Mic. iv. 1, 2 : " In the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills : and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob ; and He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths, for the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem "? Are these just the pious aspirations of Jewish patriots not destined ever to be fulfilled, or are they to be regarded as having been fulfilled in a spiritual manner by Pentecost and the subsequent spread of the Gospel ? On these matters each man must decide for himself, but for those who accept an authoritative view of Holy Scripture it is difficult to see how a " futurist " interpretation of these words can be ruled out altogether.

* * * *

Certainly the events of the past half-century are quite remarkable. One recent writer has referred to it as " a modern miracle ", and justifies his use of the expression in these words : " The modern miracle to which we refer is the existence of the State of Israel. Young people will not understand such a claim, because they cannot realize how impossible it seemed in years gone by. Even older generations are not fully aware of the extraordinary ramifications behind the story of this achievement. The State of Israel today is the result of a movement which has defied the ordinary laws of history, geography, economic and international relations, which has gone against all the probabilities and possibilities that could humanly have been foreseen ". This writer goes on to claim that it was, however, divinely foreseen, basing his claim on a literal acceptance of the prophecies already mentioned : " The prophets of the Old Testament were quite clear that at a time described as ' the last days ' the exiles who had been scattered would be regathered to the mountains of Israel. . . . It was divinely intended and has been brought about through divine influence in the affairs of nations ". He then proceeds to summarize some of these events. When Theodor Herzl published his pamphlet *The Jewish State* more than sixty years ago, he was expressing a traditional hope that had remained deep down in many Jewish hearts but had become " so submerged under 1,800 years of persecution and wandering that it was likely to stay there, as a tradition rather than a hope ". In fact, the building of a Jewish national home in Palestine, then largely a

desolate, barren area, seemed so unlikely that Herzl at one time thought of accepting alternative suggestions such as land in British East Africa. " Then came two world wars which completely changed the situation." In the first place, they set in train a series of political events which removed some further barriers, and, in the second place, led to further waves of anti-Semitism which accentuated the urgent need of a national home. At a critical moment in the Great War of 1914-18 Dr. Weissmann, a Jewish scientist, rendered outstanding services to the British Government for which he desired no reward for himself but something for his people. As a result in 1917 the famous Balfour Declaration, viewing with favour the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, was issued. " Shortly after, by some coincidence (!), General Allenby marched into Jerusalem to clear out the Turks."

After the war, however, it was by no means easy for the British government, as the mandatory power, to carry out the terms of the declaration issued at such a moment of crisis. Arab opposition led to a severe restriction and eventually a complete prohibition of Jewish immigration. " So it needed Hitler, in all the fury of his fire, sword, and concentration camps to bring pressure to bear on the Jews. Those who had looked upon Zionism as a wildcat dream now tried to get to Palestine as their last hope—and they flocked in, defying the blockades which caused a number to drown in sight of the Holy Land. Then came the United Nations, partition schemes, and vain efforts to get Arab agreement to the Jewish State. Finally came the great day of independence. Immediately the newborn state was attacked by the Arab nations from all sides. How it survived has been explained on military and strategic lines, but Bible students like ourselves will always think of it as a miracle." This writer concludes by saying : " Whether we believe that God is working with them, or whether we believe they have blindly followed a tradition handed down to them from their fathers, the fact remains that they are God's witnesses, witnesses to a super-normal force which has operated in them for four thousand years and still has a great part for them to play in the next chapter of the human story " (S.G.C. in *Glad Tidings*, Sept., 1960).

" Ye are my witnesses." These words would seem to explain the unique role of the people Israel in history, and it is in accordance with these words that we shall best be able to answer our further question as to what their future mission may be.

To this day they remain a reminder in the world of the reality of the God of the Bible, His faithfulness, and the demands of His law upon men and women. We may think that the pious Jew seeking to observe daily the 613 precepts into which the law has been broken down has carried legalism to excess. Nor do we forget the conflict between law and gospel fought out in the days of St. Paul. At the same time, in an age of increasing lawlessness when many are arguing that all moral judgments are relative and that there is no final standard, the Jew's emphasis on the Torah as the revealed will of a Holy God is salutary indeed.

Moreover, the Jew, like the Christian, is pledged to a doctrine of hope. Yet if he is true to his faith this hope is based, not on human wisdom or endeavour, but on the supernatural act of God, symbolized by the

coming of the Messiah. In the creed of Moses Maimonides the pious Jew still declares : " I believe that Messiah shall come, and though he tarry I will wait for him ". This corresponds to the eschatological clause in the Christian creed : " I believe that He shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead ". Some are still looking for the coming of a personal Messiah, some rather for the coming of a Messianic age. But the hope is there and the Jew, if he is true to the tradition of his people, can never accept a doctrine of despair. Even the Communist dream of the coming " classless society " originated in the perverted Messianism of a renegade Jew, Karl Marx. The tragedy is that the Jew does not know the Name of Messiah, the Name " given above every name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee shall bow " (Phil. ii. 10). If these words are to be fulfilled, the ignorance of the Jews cannot last for ever. Sooner or later they must " look on him whom they pierced ", and Jew and Gentile at last shall be one in the true Messiah, and so " all Israel shall be saved ". Faced with such a consummation, we can only echo the words of St. Paul : " O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God ! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out ! " (Rom. xi. 33, 34).

Book Reviews

Reviewers in this Issue

Professor J. N. D. Anderson, O.B.E., M.A., LL.D.
The Rev. H. J. Burgess, M.A., Ph.D.
The Rt. Rev. F. D. Coggan, D.D., Bishop of Bradford.
The Rev. Professor G. C. B. Davies, M.A., D.D.
The Rev. Principal Michael M. Hennell, M.A.
The Rt. Rev. Frank Houghton, B.A.
The Rev. Canon T. G. Mohan, M.A.
Arthur Pollard, Esq., B.A., B.Litt.
The Rev. S. S. Smalley, M.A.
The Rev. A. M. Stibbs, M.A.
The Rev. K. R. Walter, B.A.
The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D., Bishop of Leicester.

A CHURCH HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.
J. H. S. Burleigh. (*Oxford University Press.*) 456 *pp.* 42*s.*

FATHERS OF THE KIRK: Some leaders of the Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Reunion.
Edited by Ronald Selby Wright. (*Oxford University Press.*) 288 *pp.* 21*s.*

The celebration of the fourth centenary of the Reformation in Scotland has brought a spate of books of which these are two.

Dr. Burleigh is the Principal of New College and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh; he is also Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for the year 1960 during which the fourth centenary of the Reformation in the Church of Scotland will be celebrated. That celebration has been marked by a visit of Her Majesty the Queen to address the Assembly, an event unparalleled for centuries. The Scots are certainly showing an appreciation of the Reformation which alas, is much less obvious in our own Church today, and which may be an important factor in the talks on closer relations between our two Churches in the future. Dr. Burleigh is admirably fitted to take a leading part in the celebrations. He has given us a book which is in the very best tradition of historical scholarship and which must surely become a standard work on the history of the Church in Scotland for many years to come. Like Mr. Selby Wright he claims for his Church continuity with the past. If the changes of the Reformation were so drastic that the Church appeared to be new, that indicates the extent to which the Church had moved from the primitive apostolic pattern. The Reformers conserved the essential elements of continuity, the Creeds, the Scriptures, the nature of the Church and its primary task in the world.

The book is in five parts. Part one sketches the early history from which the Scottish Church emerges and in which the influence of the Roman mission has triumphed over that of Columba and Iona. Part two describes the development of the medieval Church—the activities of the monasteries, the establishment of parishes and of bishoprics. In view of the later introduction of the Presbyterian system it is not surprising that the author gives us a long chapter in which the failure of the Bishops is clearly established through their subservience to Rome

and the King, their political activities, their love of pluralities, place-hunting, and careerism. The stirring of a movement for reform was not only the result of ecclesiastical abuses and clerical scandals but, as elsewhere, a recovery of biblical doctrine and a desire for the discontinuance of vain superstitions. During this period, and perhaps even more during the Reformation period, the Church was deeply involved in the national struggle so that it had no freedom of independent action. John Knox emerged as the apostle of reform, and as the crisis of 1559-60 approached, his leadership, based upon the firm conviction that the Reformation was the cause of God, was a decisive factor. " The voice of one man is able in one hour to put more life in us than five hundred trumpets continually blustering in our ears." In the third section the author gives a masterly survey of the complicated struggle of the Reformation period involving internal stresses, fluctuations of fortune, and pressure from the rulers of France and England. The doctrinal settlement was not a difficult matter but the " shape " of the church was not settled for 130 years. The creed and programme of the Reformers was set forth in three documents, the *Scots Confession of Faith*, the *Book of Common Order* and the *Book of Discipline*. The third of these, set forth missionary policy rather than church organization, though it was thought necessary to appoint superintendents of areas to ensure pastoral and evangelistic activities rather than to rely upon " yon idle Bishops ". The first and last of those documents have deeply influenced the faith and practice of the Scottish church ever since. The failure of the sovereigns, either of Scotland or England, to share the aspirations of the Scottish Church led to a progressive alienation which ultimately issued in the Solemn League and Covenant and the Westminster Confession. Presbyterianism was not established by law until the accession of William and Mary. " The Covenanting struggle ", says Dr. Burleigh, " led to a hardening of presbytery and episcopacy into two antagonistic systems with a wide gulf between them which shows little sign of narrowing." But though it seemed that at last the Church had sailed into calm waters its troubles were by no means over, and Part four tells of the problems left behind by patronage which eventually to the Disruption of 1843 ; of the internal friction caused by " moderatism "; of the evangelical revival, the recovery of the Established Church, and the Reunion of 1929. A final chapter is added on the Church of Scotland in modern times. An ingenious diagram makes it easy to follow the complicated story of Division and Reunions between 1690 and 1929.

After reading this excellent book one is all the better fitted to enjoy *Fathers of the Kirk* which gives us twenty-three short biographies of the men who were outstanding in Scottish Church history during the period 1508-1922. They include John Knox, Andrew Melville, Samuel Rutherford, Alexander Carlyle, John Caird, Robert Rainy, William Robertson Smith, and James Denney. The book is edited by Ronald Selby Wright who contributes a Foreword. The writing is all on a very high level and in spite of there being so many contributors there is surprisingly little difference in style. It would be almost possible to read the whole book as the work of one person were it not for the predilections of each writer. One or two are obviously dazzled by

the liturgical movement in the Anglican Communion and have a very high regard for Episcopacy. Inevitably the record of leadership over such a long period is also in a measure the story of the Church with its tensions and its development. We thus have a more intimate insight into the struggle to break away from episcopacy, the Secession, the Union, the influence of the Oxford Movement, and the impact of Higher Criticism. Running through the long story is the thread of continuity. The Editor, in his foreword, writes : " There was never any question of setting up a new church. The intention in the mind of the Reformers was not to destroy the church as a united visible body but to strengthen and perfect its organization by purifying it from the corruptions and restoring its apostolic and primitive form. In the eyes of the Reformers there was no real disruption at the Reformation. . . . " The charm of this book is that it not only describes men of varying points of view—Bishops and Presbyterians, moderates and radicals, liberals and conservatives, orators and thinkers—but it also brings us right up to date with men like Denney and James Cooper. It is perhaps invidious to single out any one essay from such a distinguished series but it is hard to forbear a mention of George Johnstone Jeffrey on James Denney. One quotation from that essay sums up the real nature of the struggle with which this book is concerned : " One remembers the voice of this great teacher, vibrant with passion, as we heard it one day in the classroom. ' Gentlemen, there are only two ways of being religious. One is to try to put God in our debt. The other is simply to acknowledge the greatness of our debt to God.' "

We commend the reading of these two books with every confidence that they will be found both edifying and enjoyable. T. G. MOHAN.

THE CHURCH AND SCOTTISH SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT 1780-1870.

By Stewart Mechie. (*Oxford University Press.*) 181 pp. 25s.

This book contains the Cunningham Lectures for 1957. The story of the Church's part in recent Scottish social history has not been told previously and this is an extremely useful pioneer work. There are obvious points of comparison with the Church Assembly report, *The National Church and the Social Order*, written by Philip Mairet in 1956. However, Dr. Mechie's book is more restricted in period, and in method it deals much more in terms of personalities than its English counterpart. Dr. Mechie starts with the philanthropy of David Dale of New Lanark ; after a chapter entitled " Poverty and and Progress " which is mainly concerned with housing and health, he looks at several pioneers including Henry Duncan, who founded a parish savings bank, and Stevenson Macgill, who was active in prison reform, the care of delinquents, and the mentally sick. A chapter is devoted to Thomas Chalmers who dominates the book. Other figures include John Dunlop and his crusade for temperance with the backing of William Collins, the publisher, Patrick Brewster, the Scottish Chartist, and James Begg, who worked for housing reform through co-operative building societies. This man, conservative in theology and radical in his social thinking, is perhaps the most intriguing figure in the book.

It is good to have a full account of New Lanark under the eccentric but godly David Dale who built the model factories and model town of New Lanark, for he is usually overshadowed by his more famous son-in-law, Robert Owen. It is a pity Dr. Mechie has missed one contemporary account of New Lanark by Thomas Bernard in the Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor and also that his book contains no reference to Mantoux's *The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century* which gives Dale full and fair treatment and deals with the total situation. If he had, Dr. Mechie would have been saved his one howler where he refers on page 5 to Richard Arkwright as inventor of the " spinning-jenny ". The " spinning-jenny " was the invention of James Hargreaves ; Arkwright invented nothing, not even the water-frame called by his name.

Thomas Chalmers is a person of great significance in Scottish church history. He was converted through reading Wilberforce's *Practical View*. It is interesting to find that he took the same attitude to social questions as the Clapham Sect did a generation earlier. like them he was a philanthropist and a paternalist. He believed that the poor should be helped by the rich fulfilling their responsibility. He was against any form of compulsory legal assessment and organized his parishes as John Venn did with well-organized bands of voluntary workers. He, too, made the unfortunate distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor, which has really more in common with the social philosophy of Bentham than with the Gospel. James Begg took a different point of view : " Beyond giving them good advice and helping them to help themselves, especially by labouring to remove obstacles which stand in their way, the interposition of the higher classes is not required, and is only mischievous " (p. 132). This is the attitude of F. D. Maurice. It is a pity that this excellent study is so insular, for few parallels between Scottish and English social history are drawn. However, Dr. Mechie might well reply that the reverse process seldom takes place. MICHAEL HENNELL.

THE INEXTINGUISHABLE BLAZE.

By A. Skevington Wood. (*Paternoster.*) 256 *pp.* 15*s.*

The Paternoster Press has projected a series of books covering the whole of Church History. One has so far appeared : *The Spreading Flame*, by Professor F. F. Bruce, who is also general editor of the series, which brings the story down to A.D. 800. Now this second volume deals with the Church of the eighteenth century. Dr. Wood begins with a survey of the Welsh and American awakenings, and then turns to examine the significance of the Moravians, before dealing with the better known features of the ministries of Whitefield and the brothers Wesley. The rise of Anglican Evangelicalism is fully considered, and the point made that " the separate origin of the Evangelical movement as distinct from Methodism is apparent from the fact that the work in Cornwall was well established before the conversion of either Whitefield or the Wesleys " (p. 141). The contribution of the Calvinistic wing under the Countess of Huntingdon, and the organization of her " Connexion " are not neglected, the author con-

cluding with a tribute to that remarkable woman quoted from the pen of J. H. Newman.

But perhaps the chief value of the book lies in the author's examination of the message and influence of the revival. He rightly states that the time has come for a reassessment of the doctrinal foundation of the eighteenth century awakening. It was not a new gospel which was preached, nor was its message the monopoly of a party; it was not a distinctive essence but a distinctive emphasis. The biblical basis of the evangelists' preaching, and their attitude to the Bible as the final authority in matters of faith, stemmed from their belief in the supreme significance of God's revelation to man in the Scriptures. The determinative transformation effected by the revival took place amongst the clergy themselves, and it was their experience of the love and grace of God which led them to a new conception of pastoral duty. This in turn gradually made its influence felt throughout the whole Church, and found expression not only by its impact upon the lives of individuals, but in an outflow of missionary enthusiasm through the foundation of the great missionary societies of the following century, and in educational and social enterprise.

Dr. Skevington Wood is a practised historian, whose previous work in this period has already received favourable attention. His bibliography bears evidence of wide and discriminating reading, which includes not only the acknowledged authorities, but also a number of lesser-known works and religious periodicals, which add weight to the author's judgments and assessments. He brings to his task commendable gifts of accuracy and discrimination, and the over-all picture which he presents deals very fairly with the succeeding phases of spiritual development, while the darker side of the story is not neglected. This account of the Evangelical revival can be warmly commended, particularly to those who are looking for a balanced introduction to this period.

G. C. B. Davies.

THE THEOLOGY OF SAINT LUKE.

By Hans Conzelmann. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. (*Faber and Faber.*) 255 *pp.* 30*s.*

Fashion plays its part even in New Testament criticism. Not so long ago Mark held the centre of the picture as the "theological" Gospel, being thought able to hold its own, in this respect, even with the Gospel of St. John. By comparison, Luke was put somewhat in the background, as a watered-down, "humanistic" presentation of our Lord's life and work.

It has not taken St. Luke long to re-establish his position, and we are seeing quite a spate of books directed towards the elucidation of the particular theological outlook of the Third Evangelist. There was Adrian Hastings' *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem*, which I reviewed in these columns. Just now there has appeared the Bishop of Ripon's *Path to Glory*. The book here reviewed is a major work on the same theme by a New Testament scholar at Zürich, Hans Conzelmann.

Let it be said at once that this is not a book for armchair reading. It has all the massive accumulation of detail that one associates with Continental scholarship. Parts of it are more like the notes from which

an English scholar would write or lecture than a book for continuous reading, and the translation, though doubtless accurate, is sometimes a barrier to easy reading. The book is crammed full of Scripture references, which have to be looked up before their full significance can be realized. The reviewer found that he had to get out his Huck's *Synopsis* and start examining detailed comparisons between the Gospels in a way that he had not found necessary since he took his Theological Tripos !

In some ways the book represents a return to detailed synoptic comparison that we have not seen since Streeter's *Four Gospels* published in 1924. One might have thought that every ounce of meaning had already been extracted from this method of study, but the author proves that this is not so. Again and again he points out little-noted changes as between Luke and Mark, and Luke and Q, in most of which he sees theological significance. Although he is primarily interested in Luke as a Christian theologian, he makes use of a liberal critic's freedom of analysis. Most *Churchman* readers would raise their eyebrows at his frequent assumption of " editorial revision " or " original composition " in the columns of St. Luke's Gospel, but careful examination shows that there is certainly a case for examination in many of the statements that he makes.

There can be space here only for a bald summary of his position. There are five parts to the book, which covers Acts as well as Luke. The first deals with geography, and Conzelmann here tries to show that Luke is not concerned with the actual historical geographical placing of the incidents, but with their " symbolic " geography. The journey to Jerusalem he believes to be full of meaning, but impossible to mark on a map. He even doubts whether Luke had a clear idea of the relative location of Samaria and Galilee. Then come sections on Eschatology, Redemptive History, Christ as the centre of History, and Man and Salvation (including the Church).

The most definite point he stresses is that Luke has " spread out " Mark's eschatological programme. Instead of the " double crisis " of Mark—the proclamation of the Kingdom and the imminent Parousia—Luke sees " the end " as long distant, though certain, and hence separates the political and military disasters to Jerusalem from the apocalyptic happenings which are blended with them in Mark xiii. Another result of his changed perspective is the concentration on personal repentance and conversion as the right response to the Gospel.

I have learned a lot from this book, but cannot follow the learned author all the way. In particular, I doubt the view—though widely held—that St. Luke sees no connection between the Passion and the Forgiveness of Sins. There is no space to debate it here, but I believe the assumption is made much too rapidly. RONALD LEICESTER

THE WAITING FATHER : SERMONS ON THE PARABLES OF JESUS. *By Helmut Thielicke.* (*James Clarke.*) 192 *pp.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

This is some preaching—alive and gripping ! It is the work of a professional German theologian, translated into English by an American, John W. Doberstein (a flat is a *duplex*, trousers are *pants*, a peep

is a *peak*, and a cheque a *check*), and printed in small type. But, unlike so many spoken sermons when they undergo the ordeal of printing, these have not died. I repeat, they are alive and gripping.

How is this? I find at least four answers, and they may be clues to all who seek the revival of great preaching. *First*, Helmut Thielicke knows his theology. He should do—he has held the chair of systematic theology at Tübingen and is now dean of the faculty of Theology in Hamburg University. (He lectured widely in the States in 1956.) *Secondly*, he loves our Lord Jesus Christ. This shines out clearly in almost every sermon. *Thirdly*, he shares his Master's compassion for men. And *fourthly* (an outcome of the third answer), he takes trouble to translate his theology into everyday language and to illuminate his message by everyday illustrations. I am impressed by the monosyllabic simplicity of much of this book—due, no doubt, partly to the skill of the translator, but even more to the labour of a great theologian in breaking the bread for his non-theologically minded listener.

In the light of these four factors, it is not wholly a matter for surprise that twice a Sunday 4,000 people, of all stations and degrees of education, flock to hear Dr. Thielicke. He is possessed of good news, and he knows how to get it across.

There are sixteen sermons here, on fifteen of the parables of Jesus (the Prodigal Son gets two, one for the younger brother and one for the older). I recommend this book to those who want a fresh slant on the parables. I recommend this book together with D. W. Cleverley Ford's *An Expository Preacher's Notebook*, to those who take their preaching seriously. There are high hopes for a revival of good preaching when two such books appear within a few months of one another.

DONALD BRADFORD.

THE HISTORICITY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By A. J. B. Higgins. (*Lutterworth.*) 82 *pp.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Since the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls, the publication of the Dodd *Festschrift*, and other landmarks in the progress of New Testament scholarship, we have become familiar with reappraisals of the relation between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. As it happens, the conclusion now often drawn that St. John is probably independent of the Synoptic Gospels, and likely therefore to be just as important historically, is not original, since in 1938 the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, a former Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge, published a perceptive study called "St. John and the Synoptic Gospels", which illustrated this precisely.

In this new book Dr. Higgins comes, accordingly, to no fundamentally new conclusions. His thesis is that St. John is independent of the other three Gospels, but familiar both with traditions similar to theirs (for example, the healing of the official's son, John iv, pp. 22ff.), and also with widely different but no less historical traditions (for example, the raising of Lazarus, John, xi, pp. 40f.). While the Fourth Gospel, therefore, as a finished product, is probably (though not certainly) the latest of the four, its sources are likely to be primitive, and they deserve at least as much respect as those used by the Synoptics. Dr. Higgins accounts further for the developed Johannine

theology by the intellectual climate in which the Gospel originated.

The importance of this book, which arose out of two lectures delivered in 1959 at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and Oberlin College, Ohio, will be its approach as much as its conclusions. The study of John vi. (pp. 26ff.), for example, is of central importance, and there are intriguing examinations of the use of personal names (pp. 53ff.) and topographical information (pp. 80ff.), which successfully support Dr. Higgins's main proposition.

None the less, the author forces himself *en route* to some odd and disturbing conclusions. Is it, for instance, so clear that the Johannine audience was a Christian one (p. 15)? And granted the independence of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptics, are we really compelled to dismiss the *Ego eimi* sayings as unauthentic (pp. 73f.)? Dr. Higgins's monograph has, however, provided New Testament students with a valuable handbook which will form a compact guide to the complexities of present-day Johannine investigations. S. S. SMALLEY.

REDISCOVERING THE BIBLE.
By Bernhard W. Anderson. (*Lutterworth.*) 272 *pp.* 21*s.*

This is a British edition of a book printed in the U.S.A. in 1951. It consequently still speaks of the Archbishop of York as Canon Michael Ramsey. It provides a detailed and attractive survey of Bible content in terms of existential theology. The author is opposed both to fundamentalism and to liberalism. His basic assumption is that the Bible is to be taken seriously but not literally. Its subject-matter is God's self-revelation, as the God who takes the initiative to seek and to save. The Exodus, the Exile-and-Return, and the Crucifixion-Resurrection are the crucial events. In this drama of biblical history God reveals His judgment upon sin, and His intention and power to recreate. The single theme of the New Testament is said to be stated in II Corinthians v. 19 and Romans v. 8.

Dr. Anderson "cuts the knots" of some problems of biblical interpretation by treating them with theological indifference. Indeed, he seeks to have it both ways: to admit historical unreliability, but to retain theological value. The Virgin Birth is somehow to be treated both as symbolically true theologically, yet actually untrue historically. The vision of the Second Coming of Christ is a myth which employs the language of time and space to communicate the Christian faith that God's redemptive purpose will ultimately triumph.

Yet, over against those who have little use for the Old Testament, it is with Dr. Anderson "an axiom" that "without the Old Testament the distinctive message of Christianity would evaporate into thin air". Prophecy and miracle cannot be discarded. They are part of the essential warp and woof of God's special revelation. But they need to be properly appreciated. They do not involve the literal fulfilment or truth of every detail of the scriptural record.

As one whom Dr. Anderson might classify as a fundamentalist, though not one who holds some of the crude views he ascribes to this type, the present writer cannot honestly say that "Rediscovering the Bible" is for him the right title for this book. For his faith is prepared to attribute more to God's special inspiration of the written

word than Dr. Anderson does. But this book may help some who have no proper appreciation of the Bible, and who find initial difficulty in secondary problems of scientific criticism, to get a suggestive awareness of its primary theological themes. For the age-long purpose of God and His Christ to save sinful men is here the central interest; and personal involvement by a decision of faith is shown to be essential to true "rediscovery". ALAN M. STIBBS.

PASTOR ON THE NILE: A MEMOIR OF BISHOP L. H. GWYNNE. *By H. C. Jackson.* (*S.P.C.K.*) 270 *pp.* 16s. 6d.

In his foreword to this biography the Archbishop of Canterbury writes: "Bishop Gwynne was a great saint and a great hero of the Church. . . . The Bishop was also pre-eminently what not every saint or every hero is—a grand person, capturing everyone by the sheer exuberance and richness of his personality". The justice of that appreciation is borne out by the reading of this book, for even those who never met him will feel as if they have been drawn into the wide circle of his friends. My own acquaintance with him was of the slightest, though I happen to be, like him, one of the few alumni of St. John's Hall, Highbury, who have become bishops. It was while he was in training at Highbury that he was profoundly moved by the murder of General Gordon at Khartoum, but it was thirteen years after his ordination in 1886 before, in response to an appeal by the C.M.S., he offered to go as a missionary to the Sudan. The early years were years of frustration, largely because the British authorities felt it unwise to sanction any definite missionary work amongst the Muslim Sudanese. Indeed, for a long time the door was closed even to work amongst the wholly pagan tribes to the south. "I was a preacher with my mouth shut," he wrote. At length, in answer to many prayers, the Sirdar, General Wingate, informed him that Lord Cromer had given permission to open Christian schools in Khartoum, but that was the only concession that the authorities were then prepared to make.

Side by side with normal missionary activities, Gwynne gave much time to the British community, and to the troops stationed in Khartoum. His prowess as a sportsman broke down prejudice and opened doors of opportunity. In 1908 he was consecrated as Suffragan Bishop of Khartoum, and during the next few years he travelled very widely throughout the whole of the Sudan, returning frequently to Khartoum, where the Cathedral was consecrated in 1912.

In the providence of God he was in England when war broke out in August, 1914, and though he was already over fifty years of age, he prevailed upon his old friend and fellow-Johnian, Bishop Taylor Smith, to allow him to go to France as a chaplain. In 1915 he was appointed Deputy Chaplain-General. So outstanding was the spiritual value of his work that Field-Marshal Plumer named Gwynne as "the man who did most to win the war"!

Back in the Sudan in 1919, and from 1920 Bishop in Egypt and the Sudan, he exercised an ever-widening influence. It is refreshing to note that a Highland regiment was allowed to receive the Sacrament "according to the Scotish (i.e., Presbyterian) order" in Khartoum

Cathedral, and that Gwynne even invited "a visiting Scottish Moderator" to administer Holy Communion "according to the Anglican order". He was never afraid to act on his belief in the essential unity of all who love our Lord.

In the second World War he was a tower of strength to the British community in Cairo, both military and civilian. In the crisis of 1942 his advice to missionaries as well as to clergy serving the British community was: "Stay at your posts, whatever happens". Finally in 1946, at the age of eighty-three, he retired, but was active in varied ministry until his death in 1957. Amongst the tributes quoted in this book, that of Sir Stewart Symes seems to sum up best the character of the impact that he made upon men: "To countless men and women in many walks of life he lent a helping hand in time of need. To countless others the example of his life and tireless ministry gave hope and encouragement. To his own devoted flock in the Sudan—British and Sudanese—he was a true 'father in God', a radiant personality and beloved pastor." Or, to quote again from the Archbishop's foreword: "The secret of his life was that his only purpose was to capture them all for God as he himself was captured by God, body and soul".

As a biography the book irritates a little through its failure to provide any sort of framework, or skeleton, upon which the portrait of the man himself is built.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

BROKEN PATTERNS.

By Elsie M. Baker. (*Highway Press.*) 90 *pp.* 5*s.*

Here are deeply interesting pictures of modern Japan by one who served as a C.M.S. missionary in Osaka before the war, and after seventeen years had the privilege of returning to the same area. Miss Baker found that friendship could "be picked up again . . . just as if there had been no break". But the necessary adjustments could only have been made by one who in her earlier term of service had won the love and respect of the people. Thus she was in a position to appraise the situation in this post-war era. The population, still growing very fast, has been compelled to renounce expansionist dreams. Yet how long can these crowded islands support so many millions of people, nearly all of them literate, and naturally expecting continuous economic advancement? Miss Baker is convinced that the people as a whole are determined not to become embroiled in another war, and probably many would prefer that their country should adopt a neutralist role, rather than be regarded as the first line of defence for the United States;

Only half of one per cent of the people are Christian, and the proportion is very much smaller in rural areas. Miss Baker rightly urges the need of prayer that "young Japanese men and women who know Christ will hear His challenge to go into the rural areas and be His witnesses". But this is not to say that more western missionaries—of the same type as Miss Baker, one would like to suggest!—are not urgently needed if Japan is to be evangelized.

This little book is full of stories of Japanese who have found the Saviour, and of some who are truly concerned to win others. But the ambition of most young people—and Japan is not peculiar in

this respect !—would appear to be to get on in the world, " to earn money . . . and then more money ". When the children in a primary school were asked to write an answer to the question, " What do you want to do when you grow up ? ",“ every child without exception wrote the same thing, though the words varied : ' I want to get rich ' ".

One hesitates to criticize so helpful a book, but is there any scriptural support for encouraging Christians to believe that " the souls of all the departed ", including relatives who died without receiving the Gospel, are being given the opportunity to know Him which was denied them while they still lived (p. 71) ?

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

FROM PAGAN TO CHRISTIAN.

By Lin Yutang. (*Heinemann.*) 251 *pp.* 16*s.*

The name of Dr. Lin Yutang is very familiar to lovers of China, and especially to missionaries who served there until the tide of Communist invasion swept across the country. His earliest books so vividly interpreted the viewpoint of young China thirty years ago that they deserved to be required reading for all who were truly concerned to understand. Where he criticized the West, and especially Western missionaries, we often cried, " *touché*," and were ready to admit the crudeness and perhaps the complacency of our approach. But we grieved intensely that one brought up in a Christian home, whose father was a Christian pastor, should have drifted into agnosticism. His latest book records his spiritual pilgrimage back from paganism to a reverent admission that Jesus is the incomparable Teacher of all time, though not to an acceptance of the Christian creed. Although a large section of the book is devoted to an attempt to introduce the sages of China—Confucius, Laotse, and Chuangtse in particular—to English-speaking readers, he is ready to state categorically in his closing chapter that " the world of Jesus is the world of sunlight by comparison with that of all the sages and philosophers and the schoolmen of any country " (p. 223).

Probably the factor which more than any other explains his departure from the faith of his childhood was the fear that in professing himself a Christian he was being denationalized, forsaking the rich heritage of Chinese philosophy and denying the validity of its high ethical standards. He was " put off " by certain missionaries, who appeared to have no real love for the Chinese people as individuals, just as he was attracted by " a foreign lady who wanted to reconvert me to Christianity, and almost did so by her humility and gentleness " (p. 234). Now it is assuredly true, as Dr. Lin says, that " Christians breed Christians ", but when he adds, " Christian theology does not," the generalization is invalid. In all his pilgrimage he never seems to have considered whether in fact God has revealed Himself in the Scriptures as well as in the Incarnate Word. Theology annoys him, and he is betrayed into making such extravagant statements as this about the worship of Christians generally : " Christian worship still very largely consists in an angry minister preaching damnation in angry words about an angry God " (p. 237). " Jesus," we are told, " founded His

Church without dogma" (p. 240), but it is He Himself who said, "I *if I be lifted up* [on the Cross] will draw all men unto Me."

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE RELIGIONS.

By E. L. Allen. (*Allen and Unwin.*) 159 *pp.* 18*s.*

The primary purpose of this book is to face the question whether it is possible for the Christian, without compromising his own loyalties, to recognize that he has much to learn from the other great religions. To this the author replies with an emphatic "Yes". "It was in the thirteenth century that Western Christendom began to be shaken in the conviction that it possessed the absolute truth." So begins the first chapter; and to this reviewer the chief virtue of the book lies in the historical review which follows of the "Mission to Islam", the "Impact of China", "Indian Religion", "Rationalism and Romanticism"; of the views of such thinkers as Lessing, Herder, Schleiermacher, Schlegel, Hegel, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Max Müller, Hartmann, Eucken, Troeltsch, Max Scheler, and Von Hügel; and of Philosophy in East and West. All this covers over one hundred pages, and is remarkably lucid, readable, and penetrating.

From this discussion we emerge with the statement that, "humanism and the political religions apart, Christianity's only rivals for the spiritual allegiance of Western man are the religions of India" (p. 17). So Mr. Allen proceeds to discuss four possible attitudes to this rivalry: namely neutrality, assimilation, hostility, and understanding; and he selects Count Keyserling as an example of the first, W. T. Stace of the second, Nietzche and Ziegler of the third, and A. N. Whitehead of the fourth—which is, emphatically, his own choice.

This leads to a review of all that has gone before, and a consideration of five possible solutions to the problem of the relation between Christianity and other religions. These are (1) that Christianity stands over against its rivals as truth against error; (2) that the other religions contain an admixture of truth and error, and may be regarded as a preparation for the Gospel; (3) that Christianity is the absolute religion, "the culmination of a process of development in which the other religions are moments, each justified in its place but each transcenced in its turn"; (4) that there is no absolute religion, but Christianity is the highest; and (5) that no comparison is possible between religions, since each is a whole that carries its own standards within itself.

The book ends with chapters entitled "Towards a Conclusion" and "Communication"—and it is here that the book proves most unsatisfactory. The author insists on what he terms the "inclusive" interpretation of Christianity, in which Christ is regarded "as the point at which God so discloses himself that it can be seen that he is present at every point. . . . The God who has come to us in him may not be restricted to him. Indeed, did he not come thus that he might open our eyes to see that none is without him?" (pp. 119, 120). This is specious, but misleading. Again, he joins issue with H. R. Mackintosh when the latter draws a clear-cut distinction between the "rela-

tive " and inadequate apprehension of the Gospel which may be held by any one group or generation of Christians, and the finality of the Gospel itself as standing " not for the reaction of man but for the action of God—for the revelation of God's holy love in Christ, for all that is meant by the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, for the great things which the Father has promised or accomplished in the Son for us men and for our salvation ". For myself I stand unhesitatingly with Mackintosh in his conclusion that " to affirm the absolute and final character of Christianity in this sense merely proves that we understand what Christianity means ". Mr. Allen fails to see this, chiefly because he forsakes the rock of revelation for the shifting sands of philosophy or " what has laid hold upon " him, with the result that the real question at issue is not whether any one religion has a " monopoly of the truth " but whether there is any objective criterion of truth whatever.

He concludes : " All that can be done at present is to call for this boundless communication. What will come out of it we cannot foresee. No syncretism, no assimilation, no world faith is envisaged, but something better than these—a growth in mutual understanding, and a participation in the life of the spirit at a level where words and definitions break down " (p. 149).

Finally, he comes back to the " exclusive " and " inclusive " interpretation of Christianity, and records his support for " the thesis of the latent and the manifest Christ, as it is found in Sebastian Franck and Schelling. But," he continues, " I would add one important qualification. To neither form of Christ do we have access directly, but only in and through historically conditioned religions, of which Christianity is one. We may not therefore assume that, as Christians, we possess the key to the understanding of the non-Christian faiths, the criterion by which to distinguish truth from error in them. We know the manifest Christ only in part, so that we are not in a position to define the outlines of the latent Christ. The complete Christ, it may be, includes a glory in the latent Christ that waits to be recognized and appropriated by those who know him only as manifest. The faith that he is present in Christian and non-Christian alike should lead to frank conversation between the two, in the hope thereby to draw nearer to the complete Christ. Perhaps the time has come to restore to honour one of the oldest and most neglected symbols of the faith. We look for the Christ who is to come ".

One wonders, however, whether such a Christ would be more than the subjective creation of human minds, on however wide a basis. But is not Jesus Christ the same, yesterday, today, and for ever? And surely it is *only* on the basis of what God Himself did in Christ at the Cross of Calvary that a holy God can pardon and accept the repentant sinner? That the sinner does not always understand this may be profoundly true ; but one could peruse this book without any apprehension of the fact that this is absolutely fundamental to the whole subject.

J. N. D. Anderson.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN A SECULAR SOCIETY.
By W. R. Niblett. (*Oxford University Press.*) 132 *pp.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

All interested in Christian Education will remember with gratitude the I.C.E. Report, *Religious Education in Schools*, published six years ago. Since then the Study and Research Committee of I.C.E. has been at work on "the practical tasks and objectives of Christian teachers in secondary schools in terms of their school situation", and this report is an exposition of their findings. For the Christian teacher of adolescents this book will be invaluable, and all Christians who are seriously concerned with making the youth of England Christian will gain insight and appreciation both of the problems involved and of the contribution Christian education can make in solving them.

Professor Niblett begins from the harsh realities of the present situation: the fact that, although religious teaching be in the school curriculum, the spirit in which other subjects are taught frequently gives the impression that material well-being and technical proficiency are the only goal of life, and the still more serious fact that most English children come from homes with no sure standards of values or commitment to a worth-while view of life. The Christian teacher today confronts a situation where, in a hundred ways, the materialist assumptions of society outside the school find their way inside. In this situation the general education needed is not to be defined in terms of the addition of more facts or more subjects but in terms of changing the adolescents' mental environment. How that can be achieved is the main theme of this book.

The most important fact in this process is, of course, the Christian teacher. His position is not easy. He is normally in a minority on the staff of any school: yet he teaches children whose parents usually expect the school to be more Christian than they are themselves! Inside the school are all the current fallacies of modern secular life—the easy-going attitude towards loyalty, truth, and duty, the notion of religion as an external affair which suits people who like that sort of thing, the pervading atmosphere of triviality, escapism, and aimlessness. But school is also a place where the effect of an adult Christian life is more obviously apparent than it is elsewhere. Professor Niblett might well have developed this theme. Instead, he ranges over the factors in the life of a school which are necessary if Christianity is to be given a chance.

The next four chapters deal in turn with the teaching of specific subjects—Mathematics and Science, Literature and the Arts, History, and, of course, Religious Knowledge. Why a specifically Christian approach to Science? Because "the science teacher can so easily convey the idea that emotional and aesthetic judgments are unimportant, and ethical and moral considerations are unreal. . . . The battle for the Christian point of view may largely be fought in the science classroom". The Christian teacher must show his pupils that the kind of proof applicable to Mathematics is not to be expected in the sphere of religion, and in general he will always be ready to stress the limitation of proof by scientific method. Professor Niblett argues that in teaching literature and the arts the Christian teacher's concern will be to enable his pupils to "see man as a free and responsible

person . . . and not merely as a sophisticated physical object ". One may feel that here the professor has suggested only a partial aim, but in his discussion of the teaching of History he is much more convincing. While using the normal method of analysing cause and effect, the Christian teacher must stress the element of spiritual choice embodied in all history. Also he must acknowledge his awareness of an unknown factor—" the action of God impinging on all the events he analyses ". As a Christian he will emphasize the influence of the individual man on events, and enable his pupils to identify themselves with characters who have changed for good the course of this world.

Professor Niblett's chapter on the teaching of Religious Knowledge is frankly disappointing. He has little, if anything, original to say, and his chief concern seems to be how to overcome " fundamentalism or near-fundamentalism ". So, too, when he discusses worship in the school, he seems far more conscious of its limiting factors than of its opportunities, and beyond saying that sheer sincerity will get through, he has not a great deal of counsel to give.

But though the chapters on the teaching of Religious Knowledge and Worship in the School are unexpectedly uninspiring, there is much of real value in the concluding, as in the initial, section of the book. Perhaps Professor Niblett has provided his own summary of the aim of Christian Education in a Secular Society in the phrase " to put a scientific or literary education inside a Christian framework ". For that to happen we shall need a much larger force of equipped and convinced Christians on the staffs of our training colleges and of our schools.

H. J. BURGESS.

ENGLISH CATHEDRALS IN COLOUR: *A collection of colour photographs by A. F. Kersting, with an Introductory Text and Notes on the Illustrations by C. L. S. Linnell.* (*Batsford.*) 95 *pp.* 16*s.*

This is the latest addition to the " Heritage Colour Books " which B. T. Batsford, Ltd., have published during the past years. To your reviewer's mind, the main content of these books is the photographs. In the past one has received much enjoyment through just looking at the pictures in the various books. This present book can only add to that enjoyment. Mr. Kersting is to be congratulated on maintaining the high standard which he himself set in the first of the series, " The Heritage of England in Colour ".

In this book there are twenty-four illustrations of seventeen of the English Cathedrals. Of those which were Cathedrals before the Reformation, seven are not included. Although some of these seven do present photographic problems, as is known from bitter experience, it is a pity that the book does not contain a " complete set ", as it were, particularly remembering that not all the pictures used are outside photographs. But, so far as the illustrations are concerned, this is being pedantic—the request of one who can never see enough of Mr. Kersting's work. The illustrations used are well chosen, dignified, and well printed. They are obviously the work of a photographer who is, above all, an artist.

In this review we have, in Irish fashion, dealt with the second part

of the book first, because, as has been said, the illustrations seem to be the main reason for the book. The first half consists of—to quote from the author's note—" a short introduction to the History of the Cathedral Churches of England, together with some information about their constitutions and government ". Mr. C. L. S. Linnell has sought to do this in thirty-five pages, and he is to be congratulated on doing it so well in such a brief space.

Chapter I is a brief survey of the origin, history, and government of Cathedrals, starting from New Testament times. This is well written and easy to follow. In one or two points we would disagree, particularly the assumption that Paul's references to the " household " of Aristobulus, Narcissus, and Stephanas imply that these three were therefore bishops. So far as we know, there is no reason for such interpretation whatsoever.

Chapter II lists the English Cathedrals according to their foundation —old, new and modern—and then Chapter III shows the relation of the Cathedral with the ordinary people, stressing the manner in which rights of the people were maintained, particularly in Monastic Cathedrals.

Chapter IV is, we feel, the most valuable part of the written section of the book, since it deals with Cathedral Architecture. In a very brief space the author shows how this developed over the years, giving examples from the various Cathedrals. The last chapter deals with the Cathedral builders, describing the importance of the various tradesmen, and particularly the forerunners of our modern architects.

Mr. Linnell has also contributed brief notes (mainly covering architecture) for each of the illustrations. These again, although brief, are very informative.

K. R. WALTER.

THE LABYRINTH REVISITED.

By Nathaniel Micklem. (*Oxford University Press.*) 43 *pp.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

In 1945 Dr. Nathaniel Micklem published a philosophical poem, *The Labyrinth.* Ever since making its acquaintance I have kept it near at hand, finding it a most valuable source of illustrative quotation, particularly on days like Good Friday. So I was excited when I found myself asked to review a sequel, *The Labyrinth Revisited.* It is not written in quite so exacting a metre as its predecessor, but apart from that it is in much the same style, and has the same message. You either can take Micklem's poetry, or you can't ! Those who can find it deeply rewarding.

It draws on immense learning, and the writer enjoys using all kinds of archaic words, many of them drawn from the world of medieval philosophy. The whole history of classical and Christian thought is in the background, and sometimes the foreground of his mind. The poem cannot be described, except by saying that in it Micklem grapples with the age-old questions of theism or a-theism, and the grounds for believing in Christ, Crucified and Risen, as the supreme revelation of God to Man. The new poem is a rich seam of thought and devotion, and no one who is prepared to mine diligently in it will go unrewarded.

RONALD LEICESTER.

VOLUME LXXIV 1960

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor: The Rev. Dr. P. E. Hughes

MARCH *Page*

The Work of the Ministry

Editorial 3
The Situation in England Today by Talbot Mohan ... 6
Training for the Ministry by Donald Coggan ... 13
The Work of a Parish by John Goss 18
The Ministry of the Word by Hugh Evan Hopkins ... 25
The Ministry of the Sacraments and the Occasional Offices by Richard Coates 31
Book Reviews 37

JUNE

Editorial 67
The New Baptismal Services by Donald Robinson ... 71
Confirmation in the Church Today by the Editor ... 84
The Bible and Anglican Piety by Ronald Williams 90
Expository Preaching: Charles Simeon and Ourselves by James Packer 94
Some Theological Problems in relation to Religious Conversion by Owen Brandon 101
The Divine and Human Elements in Conversion by Maurice Wood 110
Book Reviews 119

SEPTEMBER

Editorial 147
The Spiritual Issues of the Reformation by Graham Windsor 152
Anglican Evangelical Views of the Bible, 1800-1850 by Arthur Pollard 166
Christianity and the Problem of Origins by the Editor 175
Book Reviews 198

DECEMBER

Christianity and the Jew

Editorial 227
The Significance of the Old Testament Today by H. L. Ellison 231
The Scope of the Abrahamic Covenant by Francis Andersen 239
Adversus Judaeos: The Jews in History by Jakob Jocz 245
Is there a Future for the Jews? by George Stevens... 253
Book Reviews 263

THE CHURCHMAN

Contributors of Articles

The Rev. Francis I. Andersen, M.A., B.D., M.Sc., Ph.D. (*pp.* 239-244).
The Rev. Owen Brandon, M.A. (*pp.* 101-109).
The Rev. Richard J. Coates, M.A. (*pp.* 31-36).
The Rt. Rev. F. D. Coggan, D.D., Bishop of Bradford (*pp.* 13-18).
The Rev. H. L. Ellison, B.A., B.D. (*pp.* 231-238).
The Rev. Hugh Evan Hopkins, O.B.E., M.A. (*pp.* 25-30).
The Rev. Philip E. Hughes, M.A., B.D., D.Litt. (*pp.* 84-89, 175-197).
The Rev. A. J. K. Goss, M.A. (*pp.* 18-24).
The Rev. Professor Jakob Jocz, Ph.D., D.Litt. (*pp.* 245-253).
The Rev. Canon T. G. Mohan, M.A. (*pp.* 6-12).
The Rev. James I. Packer, M.A., D.Phil. (*pp.* 94-100).
Arthur Pollard, Esq., B.A., B.Litt. (*pp.* 166-174).
The Rev. Donald W. B. Robinson, M.A. (*pp.* 71-83).
The Rev. George H. Stevens, M.Th. (*pp.* 253-262).
The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D., Bishop of Leicester (*pp.* 90-93).
Graham Windsor, Esq., B.A., B.D. (*pp.* 152-165).
The Rev. Maurice A. P. Wood, D.S.C., M.A. (*pp.* 110-118).

Reviewers of Books

Professor J. N. D. Anderson, O.B.E., M.A., LL.D. (*p.* 274).
R. J. Berry, Esq., M.A., Ph.D. (*p.* 140).
The Rev. Owen Brandon, M.A. (*pp.* 136, 137).
The Rev. H. J. Burgess, M.A., Ph.D. (*pp.* 54, 276).
The Rev. Herbert M. Carson, M.A., B.D. (*p.* 127).
The Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., D.D. (*p.* 54).
The Rt. Rev. F. D. Coggan, D.D., Bishop of Bradford (*p.* 268).
Madeleine Cowan (*p.* 59).
The Rev. Canon Kenneth Cragg, M.A., D.Phil. (*p.* 56).
The Rev. Professor G. C. B. Davies, M.A., D.D. (*pp.* 37, 125, 204, 205, 266).
The Rev. Canon G. G. Dawson, D.D., Ph.D. (*p.* 61).
The Rev. A. J. K. Goss, M.A. (*pp.* 45, 206).
George Goyder, Esq. (*p.* 208).
The Rev. E. M. B. Green, M.A. (*p.* 198).
The Rev. Principal Michael M. Hennell, M.A. (*pp.* 124, 142, 265).
The Rev. Richard E. Higginson, M.A., B.D. (*pp.* 121, 122, 211, 213, 221).
The Rev. Douglas F. Horsefield (*p.* 43).
The Rt. Rev. Frank Houghton, B.A. (*pp.* 46, 128, 129, 135, 207, 271, 272, 273).
The Rev. Philip E. Hughes, M.A., B.D., D.Litt. (*pp.* 40, 44, 50, 123, 134, 144).
The Rev. F. D. Kidner, M.A. (*p.* 132).
Leslie T. Lyall, Esq., M.A. (*p.* 57).
The Rev. A. V. M'Callin, B.A., B.D. (*pp.* 63, 222).
Malcolm H. McQueen, Esq., M.A. (*p.* 200).
The Rev. Arthur R. Milroy, M.A. (*pp.* 59, 141).
The Rev. Canon T. G. Mohan, M.A. (*pp.* 39, 202, 203, 263).
The Rev. J. A. Motyer, M.A., B.D. (pp. 49, 50, 214).
The Rt. Rev. Stephen Neill, D.D. (*p.* 58).
The Rev. James I. Packer, M.A., D.Phil. (*pp.* 42, 130).
The Rev. Canon A. W. Parsons, L.Th. (*pp.* 47, 55, 60, 141, 217, 222, 224).
Arthur Pollard, Esq., B.A., B.Litt. (*pp.* 52, 126, 135, 143, 223, 224).
The Rev. W. C. G. Proctor, M.A., B.D. (*pp.* 131, 219).
The Rev. Stephen S. Smalley, M.A. (*pp.* 211, 269).
The Rev. L. E. H. Stephens-Hodge, M.A. (*pp.* 52, 138, 139, 140, 215, 216, 219).
The Rev. Alan M. Stibbs, M.A. (*pp.* 48, 133, 270).
The Rev. J. R. W. Stott, M.A. (*p.* 138).
The Rev. Professor R. V. G. Tasker, M.A., B.D. (*p.* 120).
The Rev. J. B. Taylor, M.A. (*p.* 218).
The Rt. Rev. J. R. S. Taylor, M.A., D.D. (*p.* 216).
The Rev. Denis H. Tongue, M.A. (*p.* 53).
The Rev. K. R. Walter, B.A. (*p.* 277).
The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D., Bishop of Leicester (*pp.* 64, 119, 209, 220, 267, 278).
The Rev. Maurice A. P. Wood, D.S.C., M.A. (*p.* 51).
The Rev. Principal J. Stafford Wright, M.A. (*pp.* 61, 62, 143, 223).